

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 191

IR 003 584

TITLE Impact of Television on Children. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate. Ninety-Fourth Congress, Second Session.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Commerce.

PUB DATE 13 Feb 76

NOTE 66p.; Serial No. 94-62

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Broadcast Industry; *Children; Commercial Television; *Government Role; Programing (Broadcast); *Social Responsibility; *Television; Television Commercials; Violence

IDENTIFIERS Congressional Hearings; Senate; Utah

ABSTRACT

This text contains the transcript of a one-day hearing of the Senate Committee on Commerce held in Salt Lake City to collect views on the impact of television on children. It consists of 19 testimonies, and additional articles, letters, and statements introduced into the record. (EMH)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *

* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *

* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *

* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *

* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *

* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *

* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *

* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

IR

IMPACT OF TELEVISION ON CHILDREN

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

IMPACT OF TELEVISION ON CHILDREN

FEBRUARY 13, 1976

Serial No. 94-62

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.



Printed for the use of the Committee on Commerce

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1976

68-470 O

ED124191

IR 003084

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington, *Chairman*

JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island
VANCE HARTKE, Indiana
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada
RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
DANIEL K. INOUE, Hawaii
JOHN V. TUNNEY, California
ADLAI E. STEVENSON, Illinois
WENDELL H. FORD, Kentucky
JOHN A. DURKIN, New Hampshire

JAMES B. PEARSON, Kansas
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan
HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., Tennessee
TED STEVENS, Alaska
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
JAMES L. BUCKLEY, New York

MICHAEL PERTSCHUK, *Chief Counsel*
S. LYNN BUTCLIFFE, *General Counsel*
JOSEPH R. FOGARTY, *Staff Counsel*
NICHOLAS MILLER, *Staff Counsel*
JAMES GRAY, *Staff Counsel*
MALCOLM M. B. STERRETT, *Minority Counsel*
WARD H. WHITE, *Minority Staff Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS

JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

VANCE HARTKE, Indiana
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
DANIEL K. INOUE, Hawaii
JOHN A. DURKIN, New Hampshire

HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., Tennessee
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan
TED STEVENS, Alaska
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut

(II)

CONTENTS

Opening statement by Senator Moss	Page 1
LIST OF WITNESSES	
Boss, Steven, grade school student, Salt Lake City, Utah	32
Lloyd, Jay, vice president and station manager, KSL Inc., member, board of directors, Utah Broadcasters Association, Salt Lake City, Utah; Lamar Smith, program director, KUTV; Dan Rairger, program manager, KTVX; Bruce Christensen, general manager, KBYU-TV, Brigham Young University; and Milt Davis, acting manager, KUED	34
Nelson, Dixie, president, Utah Congress of Parents and Teachers, Salt Lake City, Utah; Mary Lee Christensen, director of consultation and education, Salt Lake Mental Health, Salt Lake City, Utah; and Dr. Leroy Lindeman, administrator, Division of Curriculum, Utah State Board of Education	18
Van Dam, Paul, Salt Lake County attorney, Metropolitan Hall of Justice, Salt Lake City, Utah	26
Wolsey, Heber G., assistant director for public communications, Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints, Right Rev. Otis Charles, Episcopal bishop for the State of Utah; Sister Patricia, principal, Bishop Glass Learning Center; Rev. Jay H. Confair, Wasatch Presby- terian Church; and Rev. Donald Proctor, Bountiful Community Church	3
Young, Susan, junior high school student, Salt Lake City, Utah	30
ADDITIONAL ARTICLES, LETTERS, AND STATEMENTS	
Cline, Dr. Victor B., professor of psychology, University of Utah, statement	50
Harrison, Mrs. John, letter of February 4, 1976	52
Miscellaneous TV schedules	53
Ogara, Charlotte, article	49

IMPACT OF TELEVISION ON CHILDREN

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1976

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

The committee met at 9 a.m., in the Utah State Office Building Auditorium, Salt Lake City, Utah; Hon. Frank E. Moss, presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOSS

Senator Moss. The hearing will come to order.

This is a hearing of the Communications Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate.

Today the committee comes to Salt Lake City to hear the views of the people of Utah on the impact of television on our Nation's children.

Television is an all-pervasive influence in our society; 99.9 percent of American homes have one or more television sets. An American home is more likely to have a television set than a bathtub.

In 1974, an average American family of five or more persons watched approximately 61½ hours of television a week. An American child born today will, by age 18, have spent more of his or her life watching "the tube" than any other single activity except sleep. In 1974, children aged 2 to 5 watched an average of 26 hours, 16 minutes of television a week; children age 6 to 11, an average of almost 24 hours a week.

Television is a "mirror" on the world for children. But is it an accurate mirror? Is the world really as sick with gratuitous violence, crime, and sexual exploitation as TV tells us or our children? Is the world really as lacking in love, decency, and understanding as TV represents?

I don't think it is. It certainly doesn't reflect the life of my family, friends or constituents. The people of Utah have worked hard to give their children a better world than this. Yet, this is the life view which television, with stark regularity, has been conveying to our youth.

Scientific research has confirmed what our commonsense tells us: children are affected in their development and behavior by what they see on television. There is now general agreement within the research community that repeated exposure to violent television programming can have an adverse effect on children. The Surgeon General's expert advisory panel reported to our Senate committee in 1972 that "the casual relationship between televised violence and antisocial behavior is sufficient to warrant appropriate and immediate remedial action."

The broadcast industry, to its credit, has finally responded with strengthened industry self-regulation and standards for programs and

Staff members assigned to this hearing: Joseph Fogarty, Nicholas Miller, and James Graf.

advertising aimed at children. I hope we will hear more of these efforts and their results from all of our witnesses today.

In particular, the committee hopes that all the witnesses this morning will give us the benefit of their views on the responsibilities of television to children and its success in meeting those responsibilities to date. Most importantly, we hope to hear how citizens in Utah have attempted to bring their concerns to the attention of their local broadcasters and the response which they have received.

Before hearing our first panel of witnesses, I wish to emphasize that the committee is here to listen. We have, in my judgment, an excellent cross section of community opinion, interested television broadcasters, as well as concerned parents, religious leaders, educators and public officials. All deserve a full and fair opportunity to be heard, and all will have it.

Television, as I indicated, has the greatest potential of any medium for good or ill. By talking about the problems, I don't wish to indicate that there aren't many very great advantages that come to our children through television.

TV teaches things to children at a very early age. Their advantage over my generation is immense. In my youth, we had to learn mainly through words. And it is hard for a child to get the facility with words to begin to visualize and conceptualize things that can now be laid out visually on the television set. This is an immense advantage and gets children into wide-range experiences even before they can read.

Our grandchildren are learning to read through "Sesame Street" long before they even go to kindergarten.

So we are greatly concerned with how this marvelous medium is used—both for good and bad.

We have asked several outstanding witnesses to come here this morning and talk with us. We invited the views of Dr. Victor B. Cline, a professor of psychology at the University of Utah, who has done a great deal of research on television programing and children's behavior. He is one of the outstanding authorities in the United States. Unfortunately, Dr. Cline could not be here personally this morning, but he has furnished the committee with a statement setting forth his opinions on the activities of television. This will be printed in our record in full so that it will be available to everyone.¹

Senator Moss. Our first panel of witnesses this morning comes from the religious community here in our State. We ask these witnesses to come forward and sit in the chairs at the table immediately before me.

We are delighted that these people were able to come.

Elder Thomas Monson of the Council of the Twelve of the LDS Church had planned to be here. But he was unable to come because of a conflicting assignment. However, Heber Wolsey, assistant director for public communications of the Church of the LDS, is here. The other members of the panel include the Reverend Otis Charles, the Episcopal bishop of the State of Utah; Sister Patricia, principal of the Glass Learning Center; Rev. Jay H. Confair of the Wasatch Presbyterian Church; and the Reverend Donald Proctor of the Bountiful Community Church.

We welcome you all before the committee. Sister Patricia, would you begin?

¹ See p. 50.

STATEMENTS OF HEBER G. WOLSEY, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS, CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS; RIGHT REV. OTIS CHARLES, EPISCOPAL BISHOP FOR THE STATE OF UTAH; SISTER PATRICIA, PRINCIPAL, BISHOP GLASS LEARNING CENTER; REV. JAY H. CONFALL, WASATCH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH; AND REV. DONALD PROCTOR, BOUNTIFUL COMMUNITY CHURCH

Sister PATRICIA. I understood this was going to be televised so I brought a chart.

Senator MOSS. We are glad to have the chart.

Sister PATRICIA. So at some point I will show the chart.

Senator MOSS. That will be fine.

Sister PATRICIA. I am approaching this whole topic from the viewpoint of an educator. In education we always begin with the child. We look at the child and we ask: What does the child need to be what he has the potential to become? We develop the program that will best meet these needs.

Our topic today is television, what impact it has on a child. Does television meet the basic needs of the child? If the child spends a great deal of time watching the television, is he going to reach the fulfillment of his potential?

Before we can answer these questions, let's go over the basic needs of the person. Let's take a look at what we call his basic needs for any person to grow or to develop into a self-directed, a self-fulfilled person.

In speaking about basic needs, one can break them down into five categories: Physical, emotional, intellectual, social, and religious. But in this chart I have used more detail in explaining the development of the personhood of the individual because in television you are talking about what makes him a person and what develops him into that person.

So what are these needs for a happy, normal, well-balanced person?

I begin at the top there with love. To fulfill the need for love in any person we must hear it, see it, feel it. We must be with others. People must actually say, "I love you." People must want to be with you. They accept you just as you are.

The physical or body needs are food, shelter, rest, and exercise. Security, he does not live in fear, his mind is at rest.

The mind is not given more than it can handle. A child's mind can handle the child's problem, not an adult problem.

We go on to the self-image. We listen to him, talk to him, we praise and help and love him. He knows he is important. You have told him he is important.

So if you are loved, if you have your physical needs met, if you have security, if you have a good self-image, then you are ready to communicate. So we have the communication need there.

You can take other spots into your own mind. You can listen and not be afraid. You can share what you know with others. You know you have something to share, and there is great joy in sharing.

And so you go on to social. The social needs. Able to play games, not being afraid of a group. There is lots of give-and-take in a group and lots of sharing.

You go on to imagination. The imagination develops. One can dream. We all must dream. Only when you begin seeing things as we want them to be, will there be change. In imagining many times we are alone.

So the child must learn to be alone, to be able to entertain himself, to be satisfied with who he is.

Let's go on to curiosity. This is how he learns. His mind is alert to something outside himself. He begins to ask questions. How? What? When? We must explore them for ourselves.

We go on to judgment. There is a very basic need for judgment in a person. One needs to be able to judge for himself, able to look at both sides of a situation and able to make a choice.

Now, the need for God, that there is something greater than himself and that person is God. We all have a basic need for great love, great dependence and great strength. Whatever name you give it, there is someone beyond ourselves.

So I have taken these basic needs, whether we are talking about television, books, radio, there are basic needs in a person that must be fulfilled.

And I secondly go on to: our lives are lived in time. The hours, the minutes, the day is where these needs are met and I ask the question: What is the child's day? What is his schedule? For the child in school, school takes up 6 to 7 hours.

The child is under the parents' supervision and care probably only 5 or 6 hours a day. This is very little time especially when we know that the parents are the primary educators of the children.

The most lasting values are given to children by their parents.

Now we go with the needs. We know there is time available. We know that parents are the basic teachers of these children.

So I ask the question: What happens if parents are not available at this time? This is prime time for parents. So parents are not at home, if children are not busy in some way, the only American past-time for the present is television. It is day and night. In many homes, television takes the place of parents.

In other words, television is trying to fulfill the needs of our children. And I ask you: Is this possible? Again, I think sometimes we think of studies that have or have not been made. There is no need to make a study to find out what the basic needs of a child are. It has been done for over 2,000 years. So it was done long before television took over in our homes and these needs are just the same.

So just glancing back at that chart, let's take love, the greatest love is need for feeling love and being loved.

Just taking the physical need of exercise, it is not possible to get exercise if we are sitting 3 or 4 hours in front of the television set.

We just made a study this week in our own area and it is about 5 hours a day that they are watching television.

Security, I think the problem of violence, fear, crime, that's on this television; and we know from studies that children cannot mentally, emotionally handle these problems.

Self-image, communication, social needs, we know from watching television that there is pretty much of a passive atmosphere. So these needs are not fulfilled.

The imagination—I say perhaps there could be some development of the imagination if he takes from the television and uses what he has, what he has found there.

Curiosity, yes, that could lead to further question, to more development if he asks the right questions.

Judgment, is his judgment developed? With direction, if there is someone there to evaluate that program, perhaps judgment could be developed.

God, again if God is made present, if life is presented more than just getting all I can get out of it for myself. But I think here we should give some thought to the commercials which take up a great deal of television.

And have you noticed that practically all of them are self-centered. It is my car, it is my shampoo, it is my trip. There is not too much community of other centers.

So now let's stop and let's think: What do we want our children to become? We want happy, normal, well-balanced children. We must give them only that which will foster this in them.

I believe that today's television has forgotten who we are serving. We are serving human beings with human needs. And these human beings are made for something much greater than materialism, crime, and violence.

We are searching people, we are hoping to help people who are searching for truth and we all have a natural longing for the good.

So I feel the real tragedy is that we are not using this wonderful invention properly. Instead of raising the standards of the mind and body, we are lowering these standards in many instances.

A frightening thing that also happens with television is that child imitation takes place. There was an article in Saturday Review written by Norman Cousins and he told of a second grader who went home from school with his report card with a low grade. And his father was very upset.

And the little boy said, "Daddy, I can take care of that. I saw it on television the other day. All we have to do is give my teacher a box of candy and shoot a little poison in the piece of candy."

Yes. They imitate and there are many, many stories of this nature. Some have gone through the imitation and made it a reality.

So I just have some closing questions and I say: Do you have children? Do you know your children? Do you know what they need in order to be people of deep conviction, rounded personalities, strong beliefs and healthy attitudes? If you really know and if you want only the best for your children, then Switch, Kojak, FBI, Hawaii Five-O, and Adam-12, and other stories that deal with crime, violence, killing total disrespect for the human person will not be allowed in your home.

You must look carefully through the TV Guide. You must know what your children are watching. They are your responsibility.

How do we put a stop to the corruptness of today's television?

You write your TV stations, your Senators and your Congressmen and you don't give up until there is a change.

Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you.

Did you say that you found from your survey of the Class Learning Center that the children were watching an average of 5 hours a day of television?

Sister PATRICIA. Yes.

I interviewed about 50. But the average is 5 hours, yes.

Senator Moss. For 5 hours a day, does a parent really have an opportunity to control the programs that get to the children?

Sister PATRICIA. That was one of my questions and my judgment is about 5 percent of the parents know they are watching them.

Senator Moss. That's of course, something that puzzles us all. How do we get more parents to accept the full responsibility of the direction of their children? And yet television is so pervasive that it isn't really practical for even committed families to totally control what children watch on television.

Sister PATRICIA. I would say there is television to be watched.

Senator Moss. If you can get them on the right channel.

Sister PATRICIA. Yes. You have to be selective. And I also feel that some families have such a habit of television, that you are going to have to work for a while in changing that habit and giving them something else besides television.

You go into a home, and the only conversation you might hear is: "What channel do you want next?" So, I think we have to do something to change the pattern.

Senator Moss. The broadcasters, as part of their self-regulation effort to improve this setup have instituted "the family viewing period," which is the first 2 hours of prime time.

Have you monitored those programs, particularly to see whether they really are family oriented programs?

Sister PATRICIA. I can't say that I have watched a lot of television. I feel some of the family programs are not the ideal family situation.

It represents the parents sometimes as not being the parents that I would want for these children.

Senator Moss. You were critical of the commercials on children's television and the materialism they teach children.

Do you foresee any way to deal with this problem?

Sister PATRICIA. Well, I have read and I have heard that, to put all of these commercials at one part of the show, perhaps.

Senator Moss. That's been tried by some of the European broadcasters.

Sister PATRICIA. This would be one answer.

Senator Moss. Well, I take it—and I must not prolong this, because we have so many witnesses to hear—you believe much needs to be changed in the programming itself so it will serve the purpose of helping, rather than warping our children. Is that right?

Sister PATRICIA. I feel that there is such freedom given to the children in watching television, their own sets in their own bedrooms they can go in there and turn that on, and watch any adult program, any crime. And I think this is very, very detrimental, yes.

So it's the parents' obligation. It's the television producers' obligation; and I say that something has to be done.

Senator Moss. One other thing. In our affluent society a lot of families do provide a separate television for the child. So the child has access to a television by himself.

Sister PATRICIA. Yes. There is a lot of freedom.

Senator Moss. That was excellent, Sister, and I appreciate you providing this chart.

The Rt. Rev. Otis Charles, Bishop Charles, we are very pleased to have you, sir, and we will ask you now to give us your testimony.

Bishop CHARLES. Thank you.

I would like to begin by expressing appreciation for the fact that this hearing is taking place because one of the considerations we need to keep in mind is that we have moved into a new age, a new time. And you Senator Moss have used the word "pervasive" in terms of the availability of television to all the people.

That is one of the realities of the present moment. But, also, I think we need to be aware of the fact that we have passed from an old mode of communication into a new one. The impact we experienced as a result of printing, and what it did to the formation of the society in which we live is just as true of television.

If you trace the history of communication, the printing press, and the availability of books brought a whole new world into being.

It is seen in the experience of nationalism, which we live with today, that could be traced as the result of the printing press and the mechanization of that kind of communication sharing: radio and movies.

So, now we move into this new medium for communication, and it too will radically transform the world in which we live. And we have only been with it for about 25 years.

People from North Dakota tell me that it has been within the last 10 to 15 years that television has been available to all the people in outlying parts of the country.

It's a new kind of experience, and we are almost deaf and mute in the midst of this experience, because we are trying to restructure our lives around it. So, I suspect that we will continue to have a lot of pain. And there is going to be a lot of growing as we get at this question. We will need to do a lot more talking of this sort.

There is no doubt that there is an imitative fact to be considered with television in relationship to children.

Another story which illustrates what Sister Patricia was saying, a teacher from Price told me that one of the things she had to deal with in her fifth and sixth grade classes was the television-inspired desire of the children to be Kung Fu experts, and the impact this had upon the other children in the class, upon her as a teacher, and upon the building, because they all thought they could level doors and the other children, and some of them got hurt in the process.

So you have that imitative quality. I think it also has to be acknowledged that television has an impact upon our style of life. I would question the image that is given of the kind of life that we would hope people might be living.

This is seen in the soap operas, which fill the day. It is also seen in the very narrow slice of life reflected in TV programming.

The latest Time magazine says that 26 of all the shows on television are cop-type stories, law-and-order stories. And so we have a situation in which the perspective of what life can be is much too limited.

The notion that you can have a family hour and control television that way seems pointless. Children don't go to bed at 9 o'clock. They are watching the late-night shows.

One of the things a teacher will tell you is that the children in their classes don't get to bed at a reasonable hour. They are up watching TV for a good long time in the evening. The whole spectrum of what's on television is available to them.

There is a kind of violence that I would like to consider. And I think it's these issues that I would prefer to focus on, rather than the nature of the programing, not to deny that that's important.

The violence that is done to family life as a result of television. In my own family experience, for instance, I know that when the television is broken, we tend to function differently as a family unit and do different kinds of things than when the television is there.

When television is there, it becomes an integral part of our everyday living experience. That's not television's fault. It just means that there is a new factor in our life that somehow we have to learn how to deal with and it does a kind of violence to our family life.

Also, there are personal needs and I don't think we can lay all of the blame on television programing. I think that there is some kind of need which I don't understand, but which Arthur Miller describes as the idiot and the murderer within us, each one of us. In his play, "The Fall," he speaks about this. And somehow, there is a need for violence and we respond to that in ways which could be described as family ways.

The other morning, Jim Hartz and Gene Shalit said in a conversation about the phrase "kill the umpire" in baseball, that they had the sense that it's just a nice word, but in hockey, Jim Hartz said he had the sense they really meant it.

We have a need within us for violence. That is something we have to deal with outside the television reality.

Focusing on the subtler aspects of violence and what happens to us, I think that we are moving into a new world formed by television, and that it is bringing us to have to deal with education in different ways.

One of the realities in which we are going to have to begin to train ourselves and our children, is living in a world of choice.

In the past, in our communities, we could limit choice more easily than we can today. Television itself is built on the basis of choice.

I go wild with my kids watching television, because they are not only back and forth from channel to channel, but during commercial time, they are flipping this way and that. So it's a constant putting together of the program. They are programing the whole thing themselves. It's a kind of master console that they are working with and it's expressive, the necessity to learn how to make choices. The world in which we live is pluralistic. That can be bad. But I also think it can have very positive qualities for us.

Television brings us directly into a world of multiple choices where we have to make the connections and we have to learn how to decide what is good and bad.

I don't believe the world is more or less violent than it was before. I think if we traced history, we would find that people have always had to learn how to deal with violence.

But we are being impacted with violence in a new way and it's not in terms of television programing.

If you want to deal with communication and violence and what's happening to our children, then I think you have to deal with the violence within us, the real violence to which they are exposed nightly; the news.

The Vietnam war is the example we have all just lived through, and that gives us an example of how our children are able to deal with reality in constructive ways.

My own children were not committed to wars as a result of that war. They were committed to peace as a result of it. I think we saw a whole generation of young people brought up on television programming who were committed to peace, and who had a major impact upon American politics as a result of that commitment to peace.

So if you want to look at violence, is it in the programming or is it in the news? What happens to people who see direct, live, the shooting of a person.

Oswald, that was Sunday morning programming, watching that event live. There is violence. Selma is another example of violence on the evening news. We know what happened as a result of that.

We have seen the violence, the verbal violence. But we have seen other kinds of violence in Boston as a result of the busing.

We see the violence in Barcelona. We are dealing instantaneously with what people do to other people. We see the violence of our treatment of handicapped people on documentary films, of how older people are treated in nursing homes and institutions.

We see violence done to the poor. So, I am not sure that the greatest thing we have to deal with is programming, or whether we have to really get at these problems of the violence in our own life.

In a recent book, "I Know It When I See It," Michael Leach offers a view that identifies the problem and suggests that we are taking steps to cure the problem:

I think it's witchhunting to blame violent movies at the theater or on TV for our violent world * * *. I'm sure the family is a far greater factor than the television set in the family room. What worries me is not the possibility that brutal movies lead to a violent world but the probability that a violent world leads to brutal movies whose cumulative effect is to condition us to accept that violent world as it is.

He (Leach) continues:

We must affirm something of our violence, and learn to deal with it. * * * Our choice is between love and hate, hope and despair, faith and fear. And our growing distress over the glorified images of hate on the screen may be an important step toward making love a vivid reality in our everyday world.

My kids seem able to make a distinction between reality and fantasy. When their mother says: "Why are you watching that horrible soap opera?" they will say: "It's just make-believe. It's just a story. Don't get so excited."

Now, I won't pretend to know what the ultimate impact is going to be on them. All I am saying is that I think that the deeper impact has been from that which is reality and the violence of that reality.

And, recently, Dr. Thomas, the superintendent of schools in this city, said we needed to begin to deal with ethics and morals in the school curriculum.

I believe that's true. I believe that's a difficult thing to tackle, because of getting into the problems of church and State. But I believe that that's really where it has got to be. I would like to close with one example.

Sukarno said that the revolution came to Indonesia as a result of American movies.

I had difficulty understanding that, because he was talking about Clark Gable and movies that didn't seem very revolutionary to me. But what he was saying was that people in Indonesia, through American movies, saw a way of life, and they wanted to buy into that way

of life, but they didn't have access to it. And out of the frustration of that desire, came to revolution.

I think we have something of the same thing going on with television; and I think this may be one of the strongest impacts upon children today, the frustration that comes of not having ready access to a kind of life that is being shown as good, desirable, and open to many people.

So, I think that just through the accessibility of television, we are creating a deep frustration within people, which is based upon the fact that they would like to have access to the American life that is portrayed for them.

They don't have access to that life. The thing that may be most detrimental, is that television suggests there are ways to get that life—violently.

Senator Moss. Thank you, Reverend Charles, for that very interesting and illusive discussion of the problem.

You said your children could discern TV as fantasy. But they are older—what age are they?

Rev. CHARLES. That statement would be at this minute when they are at the college level. The oldest is 23.

And television first came into our life in about 1959, or a little earlier than that, maybe 1956. So for all intents and purposes, they have grown up with television.

And all I can say is that I don't know what they would have been if they hadn't had television. But they seem to be fairly healthy and they do seem to be able to separate fact from fantasy. The thing that makes the greatest impact on them is fact which they get from television.

Senator Moss. We read the outcry that "Johnny can't read anymore." Do you think this loss of reading and writing skills among our young people is the fault of television?

Rev. CHARLES. I think you would have to evaluate that in different ways. I would hope that everybody would have the ability to read and write. Our youngest daughter, however, has no interest in books. She's oriented to television. But I am not sure that that's totally bad. I think that one of the tremendous opportunities we have is to use television in a whole new learning experience. And when there is something that can't be found (learned) in that way, to go after it in another. I would love my daughter to read Dickens. But I just think that's another world.

Senator Moss. I think you mentioned that our society is deaf and mute with the advance of TV.

Rev. CHARLES. In the sense that we don't know how to deal with this situation.

That is actually a McLuhan phrase and I think McLuhan states it as well as any commentator of whom I'm aware. Basically he is saying that culture was totally acoustical; the whole universe is where the learning took place. With printing it became more and more narrow.

Today with television, it is becoming more and more expansive and we don't know how to function. So, deaf and mute in not knowing how to function in the world. It is a new world.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much.

All of these contributions are so interesting. I am inclined to have dialog rather than go on. But we have others that we want to hear.

Heber Wolsey, the associate managing director of public communications of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. We will ask you to go ahead now.

Mr. WOLSEY. Since, in our belief, the family is the most important organization in society, it is understandable that we are highly concerned about what goes into the homes in our Nation.

Television, because of its tremendous power to influence those who view it, has a great responsibility to its many audiences. Children especially are highly impressionable and thus form many lasting personal values from the television fare available to them.

Television can be a great influence for good in their lives. It can and does give them opportunities to gain great insight and understanding of peoples and places from which they seldom, if ever, would have an opportunity to gain experiences on a direct personal basis.

Television licenses in America are made available to station owners expressly for the purpose of programing in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. That is, the public's needs are paramount. We urge television stations and networks throughout our land to place a major emphasis on programing that will help to build strong family units and elevate the individual family members.

The broadcast group with which we are affiliated recently published a statement which states in part—

There is a crucial need for television programs that effectively communicate the moral standards and vital ideas so essential in a wholesome society and to help strengthen the family and the home.

We subscribe to this philosophy. Our leaders have voiced their support of television programing that will help to accomplish those goals.

At the most recent conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, in October 1975, the world leader of the Church said—

As we witness the growing wave of violence and sex, we are dismayed by the efforts of so many to bring into our living rooms vivid portrayals of such conduct. But at the same time we are encouraged by the expressed desire of executives decisions of television networks to reserve at least a portion of the early evening hours for entertainment when parents may watch with their children without embarrassment.

It is a beginning which we earnestly hope will be enlarged. God bless their righteous efforts that our precious families may be protected from this evil.

Mr. Gordon B. Hinkley, member of the council of the 12 apostles of the church, at the same conference expressed these comments—

—When there is a good show in town, go to the theater as a family. Your very patronage will give encouragement to those who wish to produce this type of entertainment. And use that most remarkable of all tools of communication, television, to enrich their lives. There is so much that is good, but it requires selectivity.

“President Kimball spoke yesterday of the efforts of the television networks to present in prime time evening hours suitable family entertainment.

“Let those who are responsible for this effort know of your appreciation for that which is good and also of your displeasure with that which is bad.

“In large measure we get what we ask for. The problem is that so many of us fail to ask, and, more frequently, fail to express gratitude for that which is good.”

Philo T. Farnsworth, leading inventor of television has said, "Television is a gift from God and God will hold those who utilize this divine instrument accountable to him."

We believe churches have a dual role in television. First, to be constantly and actively involved in encouraging networks and individual stations to develop programing that will enhance the quality of life in the Nation's homes. And second, to be actively involved in *producing* quality programs for submission to the networks and stations throughout the land.

Our experience has been that networks and stations are highly cooperative in making public service time available for programs that deal with positive aspects of family life.

Since the future of our country depends largely on the value systems inculcated into the lives of our children and since television is such a powerful molder of value systems, may all of us, educators, churchmen, broadcasters, business and civic leaders unite in a combined effort to give our children the television programing that will help them develop into responsible and effective adult citizens.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Mr. Wolsey.

Do you have an opinion on programing that is now produced for children such as the Saturday morning programing? Is that suitable?

Mr. WOLSEY. I think much of it is. I know there is controversy on almost any program that is being produced.

I guess, to give personal examples like we all tend to do, much of the Saturday morning and weekday afternoon viewing has been very valuable in our family's lives. Most of the programing, we feel, has the responsibility to work closely with our children to help them make proper value judgments.

I am not suggesting that that can be done totally. That's a very difficult thing. And yet one of the great responsibilities that we as parents have is to get to know our children well enough so that we can help them in their important decisionmaking. And that certainly includes the decision of what television show you want them to watch.

Senator Moss. One question that recurs, and I suppose as laymen we can't fully evaluate it. But do children distinguish the fantasy in cartoon programs they have on Saturday and where the cartoon characters do such outrageous things?

Mr. WOLSEY. I guess you're asking for my personal judgment; and I think it would be a tragedy if we tried to suggest that reality is the only important aspect of a child's learning.

The fantasy area needs to be checked into carefully, but the fantasy area, I believe, can be one of the most, one of the best experiences a child can have, unless the fantasy works too hard to pretend that it is real.

I personally tend to think that we had an easier time to enjoy fantasy before television. Radio listening requires personal involvement and expression and imagination.

There was an old radio play called "Sorry, Wrong Number," and they tried to make a motion picture of it. It wasn't nearly as effective as the radio.

I think fantasy is a very important part of our children's growth. And I think it is important that we guide them into areas that can help them to prepare to be responsible adults.

Senator Moss. Do you notice any programing that you would consider particularly offensive sexual exploitation?

Mr. WOLSEY. Yes; I certainly do. And again it needs to be, it needs to have the dialog such as we are having today, to let our stations and our networks know of the concerns that we have.

It would be completely inaccurate to suggest that there are no real problems because there are. There are many problems. Many of the problems that appear on television today I guess were called X-rated movies when I was a youngster. Times have changed.

I think we must constantly be concerned with doing all we can to be sure that the important basic values of life that we feel are important don't change too much in the lives of our children. So I think we have a genuine concern, we need to have a genuine concern for analyzing individual programs.

I know of a number of programs that have been turned down by the local stations because they felt they were not appropriate for this community. I would like to see much more of that kind of concern both from the stations and from us as parents.

I have also known that often when the stations do take this kind of prerogative, they get some violent reaction from those who want to see the picture. They get almost no reaction from those of us who feel that the picture shouldn't be shown. And I think when they (the stations) are attempting to perform a local public service, it is the ones who want the programing that are heard most. And those of us who should be expressing appreciation for the stations' actions, we usually sit on our hands.

Senator Moss. What about commercials that exploit the child, that is, directed at the child so that he in turn demands his parents purchase certain articles?

Mr. WOLSEY. I believe, again, that it is highly important that stations, networks and those of us who are concerned let our voices be known when that type of commercial goes beyond propriety. I think we need to let those involved know that we consider that as an inappropriate pressure on children who may not have the capability yet to value their judgments.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Mr. Wolsey, for that good testimony and observations.

Reverend Jay Confair of the Wasatch Presbyterian Church, we would like to hear from you.

Reverend CONFAIR. Thank you very much.

The Judeo-Christian church has always believed in influence, modeling, and training as a primal influence on behavior—the Old Testament idea of "train a child in the way he should go and he will not depart from it."

Madison Avenue has the same basic assumption for their successful approach to promotion and advertising, influence a person's thinking so that choices made both overtly, covertly, consciously, or subconsciously be motivated to buy their product.

Philosophically, psychologically, and educationally, thinking has had hundreds of researchers proposing definitions, explanations, propositions, hypotheses, and theories, but all studies of thinking recognize that within the thinking process, external influence has a formidable effect, whether stimulation or imitation be the causal process. External forces do affect our thinking process.

Parents rapidly realize their personal influence on the behavior of their offspring. They can see the child imitating his parents' procedure,

mood, and attitude. Eric Byrnes, conceived of transactional analysis, said, "We know what it is to be a parent in our personality for we either have acted as a parent or we have had parents acting upon us."

Thus, we learn to model that behavior which we experience. Television has become a major experience factor to every personality. Few homes are without a TV; the hours vary, but all people experience TV on a regular basis in their lifetime—surveys and studies indicate from a few to a multitude of hours for various persons. Therefore, a parent has a sense of responsibility toward his behavioral influence on his offspring through modeling, values, and actions as witnessed and experienced on TV.

We look to the television broadcasters to recognize their moral responsibility and effect upon their viewers. The idea that broadcasters should program according to the survey of the listeners' wants is as archaic and erroneous as the concept that parents should never intervene, but let a child be without any restricting guidelines.

Certainly I believe in freedom, but I also believe in responsibility. The granting of a public license has the expectation that the recipient will use that license as responsibly as we expect the sportsman to carefully and responsibly use his public license, or the bride and groom who receive a license of public trust to responsibly establish a home and a positive environment for their offspring.

It makes no more sense to allow the networks to give the public what it wants than it does to allow a parent to give his children unprescribed drugs indiscriminately! (The FDA has protected the unsuspecting child from this danger so well that most of us adults have a hard time opening the "childproof" bottles.)

In the same sense, we can and do expect that our children should be shielded from the indiscriminate violence and overt sex now so prolific on the various stations. I do not propose that the Government intervene and impose standards, but I do believe that enough power be given the FCC to encourage network self-control.

NBC president Robert T. Howard was quoted in the New Yorker, October 13, 1975, article "Blood Marks in the Sylvan Glade": "TV violence is something every broadcaster who believes in social responsibility must take seriously."

I would hope that this Nation, which pledges itself to be "under God," would truly have a social conscience.

There is little doubt we can function like animals. The thirst for blood—the fang, the claw; ripping and tearing flesh—has primal satisfactions, but are we not more than the ultimate violent killer in the evolutionary chain? Can we not also be man, the creature of God that overcomes his animalistic tendencies whether it be a vicarious thrill from the tube (which we allowed to be socially acceptable) or the overt violent act which we socially reject and punish? Is it not any wonder that our children are confused, unstable, and desperately seeking values to live by when they have grown up with such a double standard—the approved violence they experience through the TV and the disapproved violence which they act out?

Perhaps we can come to our senses and act as social parents, programming not according to interests of audience surveys, but according to our surrogate parent responsibility to nurture and cultivate growth in the listening audience.

The "Family Viewing Hour" or nonviolent programing is one step in the right direction—a step taken by the networks, not imposed, although pressured by the FCC and organized audience groups.

I would plead with our broadcasters to regain the motto of our Judeo-Christian land, "To train a child in the way he should go that he may not depart from it," by recognizing a person's greater potential. I hope we will reward the media which feeds our greater nature rather than rating the stations which feed our bestial ways.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much. That was well stated.

I agree that broadcasters are public licensees who should program in the public interest.

But they are subject to pressures from various sides. Television is a competitive business. And they each must make a profit as a private enterprise to continue to provide any community services.

Now, if the public demands violent programing what is the broadcaster's moral responsibility to program? How does he balance this audience with his responsibility to children?

Reverend CONFAIR. There is a public responsibility, I think, as stated earlier, to condone and to praise all efforts made to upgrade the type of programing that is presented.

But I think beyond the public responsibility, there comes a network responsibility that they have to make a decision and recognize what their viewing audience wants. Their wants may serve primal needs or motivations.

We have to recognize the human being as more than just an animal.

For instance, one of the last things I witnessed on TV was the fight out of Las Vegas. I went down to watch some sports and ended up seeing that thing. The slow motion effect of Howard Cosell's oration of this terrible, terrible thing, of a person bloodied, battered, and beaten, and then slaughtered up so you can eat every moment of it and get churred up, hardly seems to me to be appropriate to elevate a person's growth.

It seems to me it is the network's responsibility to say: hey, look, we realize we can feed one's animal emotions. However, is it a healthy feeding?

Recognizing that there is the competition for the viewing audience, I think now we have got to get off the stand that says we are going to program according to highest rating and begin to rate higher causes as a better motivation for programing. This is a social responsibility.

Senator Moss. Well, thank you very much. You have given us great food for thought.

I would like to hear now from the Reverend Donald Proctor of the Bountiful Community Church. Reverend Proctor?

Reverend PROCTOR. Thank you.

First, I admire your patience. I have read through the reports of 1971, 1972, 1973, and also here, and this must get rather redundant. I have nothing unique or admirable to say.

I hope, along with Bishop Charles, that when my children grow up I can say along with him that they are fairly healthy.

I have nine things, and they are just simply feelings, observations, gut-level things, that I feel about television, and I am not an expert. I am not even a religious expert. I am not even sure that the family is our No. 1 concern.

As a religious leader, I just feel that the individual is—that without an individual, you can never have a family. And so our stress must be upon the individual.

And so I probably oppose all four of my fellow religious leaders.

One observation I would make is that violence has become an accepted standard of behavior. Our children have grown up with it. It is a part of us. We rationalize it. We forget it. We handle it in some way. Violence is normal.

This morning's Tribune, strangely enough—and I am sure you will hear about it later—the State superintendent of public instruction says that in two studies made in the 4th and 11th grades, he said unjustifiable aggression has shown up. That is a fact of life, violence. We accept it.

Second, I somehow get the sense that television today has replaced the hero with the technique: the karate chop, the bionics, the S.W.A.T. and U.N.C.L.E. tactics of urban guerilla approaches. With the right technique, we can whip anything. We can go to outer space. We can accomplish anything that we want, with technique.

A child does not have the chance to internalize what a hero is to him, to feel, to express, to live in that world of fantasy himself. And so the hero thus becomes the highly competent techniques.

Third, I think that television must exercise caution in displaying detailed aggressive techniques and their immediate rewards, as has been pointed out here.

Some children know that if they rob a place they are going to pay the price in the end. But they look forward to a hell of a good time before they get caught. So the immediate rewards are always there.

Fourth, as, hopefully, a religious leader of a parish or at least one that tries, I think the observation may be made that television teaches by nuance and innuendo that accepted standards of religious behavior are not "in." They are not "cool."

For instance—and I can't defend it, but I would make the proposition that we have lived by legislative morality for 3,000 years, a little more or a little less, since the time of Moses.

And I think that we still live by that legislative morality. And I think much is accomplished by judicial and legislative reforms to change society.

But that is a frightening thing as well, that fine line of: When do I tread upon your freedom?

Fifth, it is quite possible that the apathy that politicians talk about today—we are teaching our children as they mature to become apathetic. They cannot handle emotionally all of the things that they are seeing.

And so what other choice do we have, to become apathetic in the approach.

I think, sixth, that exposure of our children to violence will increase. I don't think it is going to get less. We want to see that. We demand it. It is going to go right ahead.

I would say that TV is a superb tutor. It has great possibilities and yet at the same time if that is true, why in one of the major cities of our Nation have we just passed a requirement that before they graduate from high school they must be able to read?

Now, if television is doing so much for our children—the reading test, as I understand it, is at a fifth grade level—if it has such pos-

sibilities, then why can't those children read? Is that due to the teaching system, to teachers, to the television?

That is just simply a question.

I would say also that we want assertive behavior from our children and not aggressive behavior. We do not want them to be walked upon or to walk upon other people. We don't want them to be losers in life.

But we don't want them to grow up to be simply the aggressors as they mature.

And finally, I would say that every problem is an opportunity to change. It is obvious that this is a problem for all of us.

It is an opportunity, therefore, that we need to look at, to redirect, to reorient, to change, to look at the possibilities that are before us and how we get there, rather than to focus on continuing these problems.

Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Reverend Proctor, for that presentation. That was very thoughtful and pointed, and indeed focused on so many of the facts of this that are giving us concern.

You referred to the fact that we have been having hearings for a long time, and the difficulties we are having with shapirg, as far as the Government and the regulatory agency, a policy to deal with things that seem to be disturbing.

You spoke of violence being almost—that is a way of life now. But is it being overemphasized in television? Is it coming from that or is it just because of the change in society? Is there any way to know that?

Reverend PROCTOR. I don't think there is any idea I have yet seen on television that offends me. I hope that as I see it that we can talk about it and discuss it. And I think that children can do that.

I think that violence is what we are demanding, and we simply accept it as part of us. And it is nothing out of the ordinary for children to sit and to watch four or five police shows in a row while at the same time one night one of our local stations—I can't tell you what—made a great play out of cutting some sexual show that probably would have been healthy for our children to see, and some of the language, and recommended watching an alternative kind of program, and the opening scene was a guy getting shot in the gut with a shotgun.

Now, what is violence? And I don't have any answers, but I am alert to the problem and I don't think there is a scapegoat.

Senator Moss. Like you, I have a feeling about Johnny not being able to read and write, that that might tie in a lot to the change in children's activities in video and audio communication. We are getting away from the written word.

Have any of you had any experience, have you tried by communicating with your local stations on programing? What kind of reception did you have? Could any of you respond to that? Have you called up and said you had an objection?

The reference has been made a number of times that the responsibility is largely the viewer's to communicate with the broadcasters. I just wonder how much we are doing of that.

Sister PATRICIA. I haven't been in this area very long, but in the San Francisco area I had parents and children write letters, and I, myself, have called broadcasters.

Senator Moss. Did they seem to be receptive and concerned? Or did you get a rather perfunctory answer?

Sister PATRICIA. Sometimes we didn't get an answer.

I think it was just to let them know how we felt about what was being produced. But I don't remember even hearing from them.

Reverend CONFAIR. One factor I have experienced is boycotting the sponsor and let them know this. That draws a lot of reaction, letting both the station and the sponsor know of your total objection to the presentation and boycott the product. Then they respond.

Senator Moss. You have found that to be effective?

Reverend CONFAIR. Yes.

Senator Moss. This is a very fascinating subject. I am reluctant to let you go, but I see others that we want to be heard too. Let me commend you. It has been an excellent presentation, one that will help us greatly.

We would like to keep in touch with you and ask for your further comments. Your comments today have all been very thoughtful and I am grateful to you all.

Thank you.

We now have a panel of parent/educators. And I ask Mrs. Dixie Nelson, president of the Utah Congress of Parents and Teachers, Mrs. Mary Lee Christensen, director of consultation and education of the Salt Lake Mental Health, and Dr. LeRoy Lindeman, administrator of the Division of Curriculum, Utah State Board of Education to come forward. We welcome you to this hearing today.

STATEMENTS OF DIXIE NELSON, PRESIDENT, UTAH CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH; MARY LEE CHRISTENSEN, DIRECTOR OF CONSULTATION AND EDUCATION, SALT LAKE MENTAL HEALTH, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH; AND DR. LEROY LINDEMAN, ADMINISTRATOR, DIVISION OF CURRICULUM. UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Senator Moss. We are discussing primarily the effect of television and television programming on children, particularly as to exploitation, violence, or explicit sex, or any other factor which you would like to talk to us about. Our main subject is the impact of television on children.

Mrs. Nelson, president of the Utah Congress of Parents and Teachers, would you go ahead?

Mrs. NELSON. Thank you, Senator Moss, and may I express our appreciation to you here for giving us this opportunity.

Violence on television is a real concern to us, both statewide and nationwide. Last year I had the opportunity, along with 13 other delegates from Utah, to attend the national convention in Atlantic City. And at this convention we passed a resolution entitled, "Violence in TV Programming." And it is quite short and I would like to read it to you in its entirety.

Whereas, children spend countless unsupervised hours watching TV; and

Whereas, the choice of program offerings often is less than desirable, with much emphasis on violence; and

Whereas, children are known to imitate observed behavior and actions; and

Whereas, statistics reveal an alarming increase in crime committed by younger and younger children; and

Whereas, the Surgeon General's report states that there can be a cause-and-effect relationship between watching violence on TV and aggressive behavior in children and young people; and

Whereas, at this time TV programming is self-regulated by the broadcasting industry through the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) TV Code, a voluntary code not subscribed to by all stations, and the provisions of which are repeatedly violated; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National PTA urge its state congresses, districts, councils, and local units to observe and monitor TV programming and commercials in their areas; and, where an excessive amount of violence in programming is seen, to make known their views with documented reporting to sponsors of the program, with copies to the local TV stations, to the TV network, to the NAB, to the Federal Communications Commission, and to their elected Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, that the National PTA demand from networks and local stations reduction in the amount of violence shown on television programs and commercials during the entire day, with particular attention to viewing hours between 2:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., and weekend morning hours when impressionable children and young people are most likely to be watching; and be it further

Resolved, That the National PTA, through its state congresses, districts, councils, and local units demand, if the self-regulation of programming and commercials by the broadcasting industry does not result in better TV programming with less emphasis on violence, that the Federal Communications Commission establish and enforce regulations limiting the number and percentage of programs of violence to be presented each day.

I have received a communique from Carol Kimmel, the national president, and she wrote letters to the three networks. She said the message was clear, and they gave serious consideration to our concern.

She said the responses to my letters tell us clearly that although the networks resent our unhappiness with their programs, they say that nothing is going to change soon.

It is interesting to note that some people feel the TV family hour is not an acceptable solution, but one that came about as a result of pressure. The FCC held no public hearings on the subject, and the networks never consulted with producers and writers who create the TV show.

We have eight regions on the national level. Utah is in region 8, and we were urged that we would hold hearings in our State to hear from the public if they were concerned about television, sex and violence on TV. We did run an article in the Desert News asking for people who would like to respond about how they felt about television. We received in excess of 200 letters supporting what we were doing. The only one derogatory if you can call it derogatory, one gentleman filled in on the little slip: "Turn off the blank television set."

Out of the 200 letters, they were all in support. One gentleman even sent us \$10, which we greatly appreciated, for our efforts. And I do have those with me today.

We did hold three different hearings at the State board of education. We tried to fill all people's needs. We held one in the morning, one in the afternoon, and one in the evening. The meetings were conducted because we had heard from many parents complaining about television programming and the eroding effects upon children and youth.

Between 50 and 60 people attended the hearings. We were not distressed with the amount of people attending because we had received the letters stating that they were writing their letter because they could not attend. We knew that the only ones that would be attending were those requesting to speak. And so we felt very good about the hearings.

We had representatives from Salt Lake's four television stations. May I say that we appreciated them coming and their input at the hearings. And we felt it was very beneficial hearing their concerns and problems also.

Mainly, participants were in favor of the family viewing hour concept but have seen little change in the programming since it went into effect. We had high school students there and a psychologist, Dr. Cline; businessmen, legislators, and representatives of various community organizations and private citizens. They also said that the were concerned about many of the things shown in the family TV hour that they did not appreciate.

Another opinion stated was that the television industry had made extremely high contributions to our society through excellent news coverage. We feel that TV has such a great potential, and we do appreciate the fine things that they are doing. Most participants agreed that television reaches 98 percent of our American homes and thus, is a great motivating influence in our society today. Because of this fact, participants in the hearing expressed great concern about the excessive amounts of violence and sex on the programs.

It was interesting—last night I was attending the State board of education meetings and a gentleman was there from WEA and he was saying the teachers felt the greatest problem today was not salary but rather the disruptive student behavior and how to discipline children and young people. It seems that children are becoming more and more aggressive, and this is a concern.

I look at my own little granddaughter who watches TV, and I am amazed at her intelligence and what she has been able to learn from very good programs. I also get a little concerned when the parents are not there all the time to monitor. We have had parents call in who say: When we do trust a program and we watch it, then all of a sudden something else is thrown at us that we do not expect, or the commercials, we can't count on the commercials. And we have parents that really are concerned, and they are trying their best to monitor television.

We are also greatly concerned about vandalism and its effect. And we feel violence goes right along with vandalism which is costing the taxpayer thousands and thousands of dollars.

I am sure my time is about up. I have many letters. I wish I had time to go through them. Letters from children, from educators. This one was from a student at Brigham Young University expressing her concern about when she might become a parent, and the effects of television on her children.

She stated:

While in the company of friends one night, we flipped through the channels and for a few minutes paused on a police story. Within five minutes we saw three people shot to death at close range. Another few were involved in a fist and knife fight. We decided we did not want to watch the show and turned off the TV.

We have others from teachers and their concerns about how they feel this is showing up in the classroom. If I had more time I would be glad to share them with you.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much for sharing with us the viewpoints of the PTA and describing your work directly with the problems.

What would you think about having a citizens advisory panel to the local broadcasters, a PTA advisory panel?

Mrs. NELSON. That would be great. Anything we could do to help with this problem, we would be most interested in.

May I again say we are delighted with some of the things the industry is doing. We are not breathing down their backs, but we just want to do whatever we can to help solve these problems.

Senator Moss. We want to avoid Government regulation of programming. But at the same time we want to encourage the kind of programming that is suitable to children.

We are going to hear from some of the broadcasters later, and I will pose that question about an advisory board as a possibility and see whether they think it would work.

Mrs. NELSON. Let me just say one other thing; may I just publicly express my appreciation to KSL. I want to thank them here at this hearing for their letter stating that CBS has cut their violence 39 percent during 1975 over 1974 and they plan to continue in that direction.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Mrs. Nelson.

We will now hear from Mary Lee Christensen, the director of consultation and education, Salt Lake Mental Health.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I am not an expert in the field of research on the influence of television on children. But as a mother I have some effect. I do try and screen my children's TV shows. Sometimes successfully and sometimes unsuccessfully, and we do try and discuss what has been seen.

But I did go to three clinical experts and I have some statements from them and they have done research in the area. The first statement I have is from my colleague, clinical director Claudia Berenson, who is a child psychiatrist. She said that she strongly supports your concern, Senator Moss, about the impact of the medium of TV on children.

The studies are complex but there is no doubt that the messages on TV which are portrayed in such intense and visually appealing manners are received and processed by children. Perhaps of most concern is that TV is a poor learning media because children are given no chance to respond to the material with a teacher or parent. Rather they passively incorporate the messages which they may distort, misinterpret and then utilize in such a manner that it does not promote appropriate development.

If a child watches a violent show and the parent can explain it to him, that is one thing. But a lot of children do not have the opportunity of their parents' presence while they watch TV.

The other letter I have is from a clinical psychologist who has done personal research. Her name is Donna Gelfand.

As a parent and as a child psychologist, I am concerned about the mounting evidence of the adverse effects of television violence on children. In 1972 the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on television and social behavior clearly indicated that violent television programs were prevalent and did incite children to antisocial behavior. This imitation effect is most characteristic of the many children who exhibit some problems in self-control, but is often found in habitually nonaggressive children.

Research by Dr. Faye B. Steuer and her associates has shown that violent children's programs—they did studies where a model group of children watched a violent cartoon and then the data papers monitored the behavior of the children after the cartoon, and they modeled violent behavior. The opinion of the scientific community is as unanimous on this as any issue. Television violence adversely affects children's behavior.

The violence rate on prime time evening programs has been increasing. Clearly new regulations are necessary. There is too much good television to be wasted, and inexpensive and mindless violence can be curtailed with careful planning.

The other statement that I have is from Dr. Richard Ferre, who is the clinical director of the inpatient psychiatric unit at Primary Children's Hospital, and he and his committee gave me and you, especially Senator Moss, the courtesy of discussing the problem at their staff meeting this week, and they did receive a lot of feedback from child psychiatrists. So their concerns are a combined effort and it is a clinical opinion.

Over the last decade much research has been done in this area to understand the relationship between violence on television and children's behavior. The bulk of the data would support the contention that present programming of violence on television has an adverse effect upon children.

An excellent review in the Journal of the American Medical Association, dated December 8, 1975, covers much of the recent research and expresses my feelings. A copy of this article is included with this letter. My particular professional experience would support the contention of the article. In particular, I am concerned with many children who have a poor frustration tolerance and poor impulse control. These children are particularly vulnerable to stimulation by aggression, and have often few resources to deal with their aggressive feelings.

Therefore, their outbursts or their aggressive behavior becomes very destructive to the important relationships in their lives. The child's vulnerability is coupled with the disruption of family life and the unavailability of appropriate adult love.

Again he is saying: OK; so the child watches TV, but if there is no adult there to help the child understand it, there is an adverse effect.

With increasing violence in this society, crime and the lowering age for juvenile offenders, it is a highly alarming situation. One cannot clearly construe television as the sole reason for this. But they would like to see more positive shows for children to model after.

In our clinical experience and practice we do use television a great deal with our disturbed children. We do use appropriate shows for the children to see. It is with these concerns that I would welcome serious consideration of legislation that would bring more responsibility into television programming, particularly in its relationship to children.

Now, I can refer you to two or three specific reports that I think have probably more significant data than any others that we have researched.

The first report that is significant, we feel clinically, is the 1972 Surgeon General's Report, volume I. And volume I seems to have some significant data. The other important study that has been done most recently is a book written by three child psychiatrists called, *The Early Window*. It is written by Robert Lieber, John Neal, and Emily Davidson.

The other people I can refer you to who are collecting recent current data on the effects of modeling behavior of children after they have watched television is Bandura and Siegel of the Stanford Medical Center. They are currently doing research.

The "Special Communications" was written by Michael B. Rosenberg, and it states specifically the number of hours of television viewed and also goes into the FCC and NAB reports and what their responsibilities are and how they have been met with clinical views. So I think this is the most current evidence that we have.

Senator Moss. They all come to the conclusion that children do transfer what they observe into their behavior?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. If there is an adult to help them, fine. But if not, which is often the case, it can be misconstrued.

Senator Moss. Did any of these reports pinpoint any particular programs? Did they identify ones that they considered violent ones?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. No. They did not particularly pinpoint. I think they would welcome meeting with the broadcasters, if they had an opinion.

I think what they are talking about is active, aggressive violence. I don't think—most of the people I talked with felt particularly that the sexual programing was of any significance because, No. 1, that is fairly carefully screened, and No. 2, most of the sexual innuendos on shows such as "Maude" and "One Day at a Time" is above most children's heads.

It is a little sophisticated adult humor. I am sure if they got down to screening some X-rated movies on TV that would be one thing. But so far that seems to be done in good taste.

In other words, one level for the adults and one for the children. But seeing violence, I personally have witnessed the "Kung Fu" episode. I worked on a mental health project in Central City 3 years ago when the "Kung Fu" program was initiated, I did see karate used several times. All of a sudden here was karate and we realized that it was a new show that was influencing the kids and that children were modeling that behavior quite inappropriately.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Mrs. Christensen.

Dr. Lindeman of the Utah State Board of Education. We are glad to hear from you, Dr. Lindeman.

Dr. LINDEMAN. Thank you very much.

If I may, I would like to start by first taking a quick look at instructional television because I think that is an area we have not yet considered.

We provide annually between 40 and 60 instructional television series for our students in the public schools of Utah. These range from courses in basic subjects to those dealing with the feeling or effective domain.

These are designed to help our youth solve problems that they face each day. We broadcast these over two stations, and reach over 95 percent of our students. This is possible because of our translator system. Nearly all the schools in Utah have television sets available in their classrooms and the students have access to their programs. Most schools also have video tape recorders now which permit more flexible scheduling. The viewers of these instructional TV programs series range from sometimes as little as 200 or 300 students to over 4,000 students.

In the larger districts these program series tend to be supplemental but in our smaller districts these program (series) sometimes are the educational program in that area. All of our series provide not only the programs which are broadcast but, also teachers guides and suggested activities that can involve students in worthwhile activities following the programs.

We think these are making a major contribution. While we have not conducted a study, per se, to measure their effect, we have many studies showing the reaction of teachers, the enrollment itself and the number of supplemental materials being used. They are all positive.

I ask you not to forget educational TV when you look at this subject. Now, let me turn to commercial television. We believe that a number of these studies have been done and were cited briefly today. However, as we work in the schools in the course of our assignments we make contact with many teachers and principals. We believe we have picked up a few strong signals that seem to pervade the school system of the State.

First, if you were to talk to the kindergarten and first grade teachers in our State you would find them saying that students are entering school today with considerably more skill in the language arts area than those entering a decade ago. They are at least a year to a year and a half advanced, according to most of these teachers and they give considerable credit to television for this change.

They give particular credit to "Sesame Street." I think it has had a dramatic impact upon the children of this country in preparing them for school. Another thing we noticed as we traveled about the State is that students are demanding more and better educational experiences. They are exposed to the highly stimulating television programs and other experiences and the students no longer accept without question the "read the chapter and answer the questions at the end" type of assignment. They want more than that.

The third thing we have noticed is that the democratic value system and the institution of the family in our society both seem to be disintegrating. Parents seem to be spending less and less of their time with their children and to take less and less interest in what their children are doing in our schools. Students are also expecting more and more for less and less.

In my opinion, there are many reasons for this. I think the action of courts to try and understand the criminal is commendable. But I think they have almost a complete lack of concern over what has happened to the victim. More of our children are being raised by other than their parents. And I think television also carries part of this responsibility for this change.

Just note, for example, how many of our programs or pictures today present as the normal situation in our country (as the accepted standard of behavior), such things as violence to obtain what one wants; dishonesty, so long as you don't get caught; sexual contacts between consenting adults; and the emphasis of doing your own thing regardless of its effect on others. I challenge these concepts even though I know some would argue. I don't think these are the standard or normal ways of behavior in our society.

How many programs do we have today showing wholesome family relationships or presenting the real issue of what happens to others when some individual or individuals act without regard to the effect of their acts upon others.

When do we really consider that? Now, as to what should be done, the Office of Public Instruction has not taken a position on commercial television. But I believe most of the staff would agree that it is better to reward programing which builds the family and which stresses our responsibility to others, rather than to attempt to censor or control it.

The State board of education has taken the position supporting the value of instructional television and I believe that includes such programs as "Sesame Street" and the "Inside Out" series.

I would encourage you to continue to support such activities which give assistance to States to produce more and better programs for use in their schools. I would also encourage you to support legislation such as title 4 of ESEA which provides resources for our teachers so they can compete with television by making the learning experience more existing and viable.

Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much.

We are about to take up legislation to extend the educational broadcast facilities grant program and this would provide for continued support of educational broadcasting facilities. And I am glad to have your review in the record to show how effectively that has been working.

On this question of children becoming insensitive to violence, have you noted that particularly? Are children, after viewing TV violence becoming insensitive to the effects of violence when they get out into real life situations?

Dr. LINDEMAN. I think my own professional experience along with the comments other teachers have made would say that is true. There is a tendency for students to become more violent and to accept this as the natural thing today. We think part of that is due to television programming.

Senator Moss. Mrs. Christensen, is there anything in your reports that would lead you to reach that same conclusion?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Yes. The problem is that if the child assimilates it and distorts it without adult consultation, they get a distorted wrong comprehension of how violence is used.

Dr. LINDEMAN. That is also our concern. This behavior is shown as acceptable and rarely do we see the consequences beyond the immediate act.

Senator Moss. Yes. I am glad to have you talk about that point. Unfortunately many times TV portrays violence as a successful solution to interpersonal conflicts. They get away with it, as it were, and you never see the victims and what happens after that.

Dr. LINDEMAN. That's right. The medium itself has a tremendous emotional impact. In selecting your scenes and treatment, you can cause one's emotions to almost go any direction you select.

My wife and I watched a show called "The Getaway" on television the other night. It had a lot of violence and we found ourselves involved. They killed maliciously and escaped to Mexico. There, they performed one kind act with one man who helped them and that seemed to excuse or make up for all the previous violence.

We had been picked up and were carried right along because the program was constructed to put you in empathy with them even though they were criminals and had no regard for others.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Even cartoons affect children. Some people look at cartoons as pure fantasy. But to a child they are real. And that doesn't mean that there aren't excellent cartoons, because there are. There are some very fine cartoons, but there are also some very violent cartoons.

Senator Moss. Well, thank you very much. I appreciate the appearance of all of you. You have contributed greatly to our panel.

Our next witness is Paul Van Dam, Salt Lake County attorney, Metropolitan Hall of Justice.

Mr. Van Dam?

STATEMENT OF PAUL VAN DAM, ESQ., SALT LAKE COUNTY ATTORNEY, METROPOLITAN HALL OF JUSTICE, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. VAN DAM. Thank you.

Senator, upon receiving your invitation, in preparation for this, I did not go to any research nor to our juvenile court, or look for studies that that had been done. I have read these in the course of time and I have been a parent and interested in the quality of my own existence and that of our society, but instead sought to think of my own experiences, of my own children, and of my own personal relationships with people at work and with people that I have prosecuted, and with law enforcement officers.

I would like to comment, if I may, in a more general way with some particulars, but about the quality of the very society in which we live, and how that relates to television, because I think in many respects television is being reflective—or is reflecting the fiber of our society and it is giving us some very important messages that I think we can no longer afford to ignore.

First of all, as a parent as I sit and observe Saturday mornings, which have been mentioned several times here, the kinds of commercials and the kinds of programing that goes on, I am amazed. I am amused, and I am appalled.

As the holidays, for instance—Christmas draws near—I think this has been commented upon, but I am overwhelmed by the intensity with which commercials are presented—to have children want and need and desire to have things without regard for the fact that there must be many, many children that cannot either afford or expect to receive any of these things.

I wonder about the effect of that upon children who are not able to have all the things that they are urged to have, and that are shown to them, that are presented. This is also in a way what is presented to the society at large because what I observe is that we are very, very strongly oriented toward having, toward getting, toward owning. And that the objective of many of the lives of parents and consequently children who model television as well as their parents, is that objective of having and getting to the exclusion of many more basic kinds of considerations in our life.

This also extends not only to having goods and toys and things, but for instance—the cereal commercials. I myself having read the common articles that are published in magazines and newspapers—I know that most cereals are without much nutritive value. But yet they are advertised to children to have such—cereals which indeed are detrimental to them without any responsibility of telling children that as a matter of fact, the nutritive value is very little and could impair their health if they were to indulge in eating those kinds of things.

I am concerned about commercials that have to do with things like Closeup toothpaste. It is subtle or maybe not very subtle to us, but it has a different effect upon children—the exploitation of the female and the female/male relationship in a sexual way is exploited and I suppose could have the effect upon children that if one were to use the proper toothpaste it is going to make a difference in their relationships with other people.

This also goes for beer and other products where the main emphasis is not upon the product itself but a young lady, or the situation. All of which seems to spin away from the reality of the situation—the reality of the existence we live in.

It seems to me—although I have no studies to back that up—it seems to get away from real good health, from the kinds of objectives we ought to have. In my own children I have noticed fear and anxiety have been promulgated, have been put forth and put into them by certain types of television shows.

I have a little girl who I think is particularly susceptible to being fearful and to having anxieties about scary sorts of situations in shows, especially violence—not necessarily in violence, but the way that some shows are structured that creates this fear and anxiety.

The aggressive behavior is frightening to her as it is to many children and she has nightmares and flashbacks to that kind of thing, which I think is very regrettable, because I am not in a position to always censor the kinds of things that she sees.

I have no doubt from what I have heard from other witnesses here today that children do model the behavior that they experience with their parents and also from television, because it is a most fascinating medium. It is a most all-pervading medium and it does indeed have a great impact upon us.

The violence, the guns, the brutality, the attitudes being reflected, especially in law enforcement areas are appalling to me because I would not personally want to take my children into most of the situations I have seen myself on TV. And if I did happen to be caught in a situation where my children and I were witnesses to a murder or a brutal shooting, or sexual assault, I am sure I would have to spend a great deal of time with my child explaining to him what had gone on and comforting him about the effect of that experience.

Whereas, in television, it is simply presented and you go on from there. And the effects from the studies I have heard alluded to here today seem to be much less than desirable in the overall fabric of our society.

I frankly would have to say that out and out sexual matters are, I think, rather rare on TV, but in many ways I would much rather have some sexual matters presented for the edification and education of my children than the violence and the depiction of the callous attitudes of people towards one another that I see on TV.

I am not personally offended by the sexual things, and would prefer, I suppose, in many ways, to have that in place of what I do see. There is a lot of aggression in cartoons and because it is depicted in kind of a jocular fashion we tend to overlook it, or see it as harmless.

I don't believe that to be fully the case. I suppose I am also concerned with the obligations that must exist and should exist in our society for the purveyors of information such as that I have stated over TV to tell the viewing audience what is going on and to even discuss on prime time in some really effective way the effect that their medium has upon us as a society.

And I would like to see some concerted efforts made and some shows sponsored by responsible people, some studies aired that tell us over the very media that we have concern about what the effect of that media is upon our lives.

We see, for instance, shows such as "60 Minutes," which tells us about the effects of a lot of things within our society. I would like to see some regular programing that discusses on television the effects of children's cartoon shows in the mornings, and discusses with us those kinds of things.

I would like to see, for instance, preceding the Wednesday night movie, or earlier movies, a minute or two discussion by the sponsors of these shows on TV as to what the content of that presentation is going to be and what items in it might be undesirable for a young viewing audience.

I think we see again on news presentations part of the whole concern that I have, and that is the accentuation of the negative that will sensationalize the attempted assassinations of the President, the maiming, the bombings—we see so much of that and yet we know, or at least I believe from having worked in behavioral modification type environments before in my life that to give attention to that negative behavior promotes more negative behavior.

I hope some means can be found to curb that. Probably the last thing I have become concerned about has to do with the many police and crime-type shows that are presented and the extremely sophisticated plots that are being put forth which are being followed by the persons in our society that have a tendency to do that, who would not otherwise come up with some of the plots I have seen.

Recently I saw one where a bank was robbed by hooking a bomb to the bank manager while he was at his home, sending him to a bank with electronic equipment attached so he could be detonated. As it turned out, of course, it came to a satisfactory solution in a near miraculous way. But there are so many of these ideas presented and it is frightening to me that we would use this media to give these criminals these ideas—to plant them and continue to develop them within our society.

I simply view it from the standpoint of a law enforcement person as extremely irresponsible in the name of selling a product or getting viewers to watch a show and it bothers me. Some of the other items that I might like to suggest seeing is possible age ratings for certain types of shows where somebody makes a determination that it might not be appropriate for children under a certain age, on TV.

I have already mentioned that a discussion prior to a show regarding what the content of that show might be, would be valuable to parents in making a decision and that TV should require that advertisers—and I know there are laws that control truth in advertising—but that it be more enforced—that some of the items advertised as healthy food items—that there would be some responsibility to express the fact that they are really not nutritional.

I would admit that there certainly are beneficial and uplifting television shows and we try to catch as many of those as we can. And there are good things happening in some of them. But I suppose why we are really here today is to concentrate on the problems after all.

Senator Moss. That's right. And I am happy to have you point out some of your experiences. Have you been able to discern, at any time, that there is imitation of a type of crime that was noted on television?

Mr. VAN DAM. Well, one situation in Davis County that some people did do the things that were presented in an earlier program. Some of the acts depicted imitated very closely some items that had been on the media earlier that same year. And I suppose it would be

impossible without asking the men themselves if they did take that from the presentation.

I think the fact that there is that imitation is strong evidence. My own experiences are quite limited as far as imitating any sophisticated type of approaches.

Senator Moss. Do you think our television programing distorts the prevalence of crime? Goodness knows we are flooded with crime in this country. But I wonder if TV is still distorted—that it makes our life seem to revolve around criminal situations.

Mr. VAN DAM. I think there are a large number of police programs, law enforcement programs, and I think the reason for that is they give the setting for the excitement and the type of violence which apparently is being responded to by the population.

Since we investigate so many of those types of things that have to do with police-related shootings, we have very few, and they are usually like they are depicted on TV.

I think it is a distorted picture in that respect of what policemen do and how they handle tough situations. I think it probably would be of no value if television shows were to present some of the conservatives' sides. If you showed policemen staking out and holding at bay the people for 30 days until they gave up and came out as they did in London, or waiting outside a bank for prolonged periods of time and negotiating with no violence, you wouldn't have a show.

We have a bit of a tendency to want to get things done right away—to shoot tear gas into that bank and kill as many people as we need to, to get the situation over with. That is not realistic. That is not good police procedure.

Senator Moss. We do have a truth in advertising statute. But do you think there ought to be some time limit or number limit on commercials that are directed to children?

Mr. VAN DAM. I have to admit, Senator, I have not thought about that at all. I would have to think about what a time limit or a number limit would do. I suppose I would be much more interested in seeing just a more responsible approach taken.

Although given more of a chance to think about it, I might come up with a different answer.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much. We appreciate your coming here and helping us build this record to determine what course ought to be followed in dealing with this most remarkable media that has such potential both for good and for bad. What we want to do is tilt it to the good side.

Mr. VAN DAM. I appreciate your interest in these matters; and as the gentleman stated earlier, your patience is amazing, and I very much appreciate it.

I would like to say that to you personally.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Paul.

I think we should take just a 10-minute break now. We will reconvene at approximately 11:30.

[Recess].

Senator Moss. Now we are going to hear from Miss Susan Young. Where do you go to school?

**STATEMENT OF SUSAN YOUNG, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT,
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH**

Miss YOUNG. Churchill Junior High School.

Senator Moss. Do you watch television quite a bit?

Miss YOUNG. Not too often.

Senator Moss. What time of day do you usually watch television?

Miss YOUNG. Usually about 7 or 7:30.

Senator Moss. In the evening?

Miss YOUNG. Yes.

Senator Moss. You don't watch it during the day?

Miss YOUNG. Sometimes after school.

Senator Moss. What about on Saturdays?

Miss YOUNG. I don't watch television on Saturdays.

Senator Moss. What programs interest you most? Do you have one program you try to see all the time?

Miss YOUNG. I usually watch programs with comedy. I like those more than the police shows.

Senator Moss. You don't like police shows too much?

Miss YOUNG. There is too many of them, and you get tired of them.

Senator Moss. Other than that, are there any other kinds of shows that you don't find interesting and that you turn off?

Miss YOUNG. I don't like to watch the medical shows, either.

Senator Moss. You like the funny shows?

Miss YOUNG. Yes.

Senator Moss. Do you watch any sports programs?

Miss YOUNG. Yes. I like to watch sports.

Senator Moss. What sport do you like best?

Miss YOUNG. Football mostly.

Senator Moss. You're just like everybody else. You are addicted to football. Did you use to watch some kinds of shows that you don't watch any more? Have you been selecting programs differently this year than last year?

Miss YOUNG. A little differently.

Senator Moss. When did you start watching programs—when you were just a young girl?

Miss YOUNG. I guess so.

Senator Moss. You can hardly remember when you didn't watch it?

Miss YOUNG. Yes.

Senator Moss. Did they have these programs like "Sesame Street" when you were smaller?

Miss YOUNG. I don't ever remember watching any of those.

Senator Moss. You don't remember watching those?

Miss YOUNG. No.

Senator Moss. Professor Cline, who works at the University of Utah, has told the committee that TV violence affects the way children act toward each other and actually teaches them specific types of behavior.

Do your friends ever talk about what they have seen on TV?

Miss YOUNG. Yes. Like there are two of my friends that always watch the show "Starsky and Hutch," and they pretend like they are Starsky and Hutch. And there is one other one, "Baretta." That's kind of rowdy. They act rowdy when they are acting that way.

Senator Moss. Do they do this very much or just once in a while?

Miss YOUNG. Just once in a while.

Senator Moss. Do you know any children who imitate Evel Knievel or any of those heroes?

Miss YOUNG. Yes; a neighbor down the street who rides his bike like that.

Senator Moss. Does this happen with many of the kids or just some of them?

Miss YOUNG. Just some of them. I guess it's just the ones that watch TV the most.

Senator Moss. Do you see any of your classmates resolving arguments by having fights?

Miss YOUNG. Not usually.

Senator Moss. If you saw a couple of them fighting, what would you do?

Miss YOUNG. Well, I don't know. I have never seen anyone fighting over that.

Senator Moss. You don't know if you would go up and tell them to stop or ask them to stop or just walk away?

Miss YOUNG. I would probably walk away.

Senator Moss. Have you been puzzled by some of the things you have seen on television so that you asked your parents about them?

Miss YOUNG. Sometimes.

Senator Moss. Would this apply to any advertising or just to programs?

Miss YOUNG. Usually it's the movie or something that's on TV.

Senator Moss. You didn't understand it and you would ask them about it?

Miss YOUNG. Yes.

Senator Moss. Usually, when you watch TV, are you by yourself?

Miss YOUNG. Yes, usually by myself.

Senator Moss. Do you have a set in your own room or do you have just one set in the house?

Miss YOUNG. I have one in my own room.

Senator Moss. So you can watch it whenever you want to?

Miss YOUNG. Yes.

Senator Moss. Do you find you want to watch TV sometimes when you should be studying?

Miss YOUNG. Yes.

Senator Moss. What kind of programs—you said comedies. But what about these National Geographic programs? Do you like to see them when they come on?

Miss YOUNG. Most of them.

Senator Moss. Do you like the ones about wild animals?

Miss YOUNG. I don't like those, no.

Senator Moss. Do you ever watch the cultural programs like the ballet or things like that? Do you like them?

Miss YOUNG. Sometimes. I usually watch "60 Minutes." It's interesting.

Senator Moss. If you were going to make up the programming for television, what would you choose? What kind of programming would you like to see more of?

Miss YOUNG. I would put most of the kids' favorite shows during the after-school hours instead of the morning.

Senator Moss. You would like them after school?

Miss YOUNG. Yes, because that's when most kids watch TV.

Senator Moss. Can you give me the name of a few others? You said comedy and I have not been able to determine exactly what kinds of shows you like. Could you give me some names?

Miss YOUNG. One I like is "Happy Days." And "MASH" is funny.

Senator Moss. "MASH"?

Miss YOUNG. Yes. And there are just quite a few.

Senator Moss. Well, how do you choose them? Do you just turn on the dial and see what's there and then try to find the show you want; or do you look in the newspaper?

Miss YOUNG. I look at the paper. And if there is nothing good I don't turn it on.

Senator Moss. Do you read books, novels or anything like that?

Miss YOUNG. Yes, I am reading one now.

Senator Moss. Do you sometimes choose rather to read than to watch television?

Miss YOUNG. Yes.

Senator Moss. That's good. I am glad you do.

Well, I'm glad to have you come because we have been wondering about what young people like you watch and how they select it, whether they think it's good or bad. Do you think it's good or bad, the way television is now?

Miss YOUNG. I think there shouldn't be so many new ones on each year that are just flops and put some of the older ones on.

Senator Moss. You think some of the older ones were better and should be back on?

Miss YOUNG. Yes.

Senator Moss. The kinds of shows you have told me about, you think those are the ones most kids watch after school?

Miss YOUNG. I guess most of them do.

Senator Moss. Well, Susan, thank you for coming. We want to go right to the authority. We want to find out what kids like and you're one of them. Thank you.

Miss YOUNG. Thank you.

Senator Moss. We have asked another young person to come. He is Steven Boss, who is a grade school student here in Salt Lake City. Would you come up, Steven?

How old are you?

STATEMENT OF STEVEN BOSS, GRADE SCHOOL STUDENT, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. Boss. Ten.

Senator Moss. Where do you go to school?

Mr. Boss. Bonneville Elementary.

Senator Moss. Do you watch television very much?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. Do you watch it on Saturday mornings?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. What kind of shows interest you the most when you watch television?

Mr. Boss. Comedies.

Senator Moss. How about police shows?

Mr. Boss. Not very much.

Senator Moss. Do you like special shows like the National Geographic series?

Mr. Boss. I'm usually not home to watch them.

Senator Moss. Do you and your friends talk about the television shows you watch?

Mr. Boss. Sometimes.

Senator Moss. Do you do that at school?

Mr. Boss. Well, out at recess.

Senator Moss. Do you ever try to imitate things you see on television?

Mr. Boss. No.

Senator Moss. Do you watch football, too?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. What about basketball?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. Do you like all sports?

Mr. Boss. I like most sports.

Senator Moss. Can you tell us what programs you can remember that you watched this last week? Can you give us a few of them?

Mr. Boss. The Olympics.

Senator Moss. You watched the Olympics?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. Do you watch movie reruns or movies that take maybe an hour and a half or longer?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. Do you see some of those you like?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. If you were going to pick out the types of programs you would like to have, what would you put on?

Mr. Boss. Well, I wouldn't mind what they put on television. I just watch what I like.

Senator Moss. What do you do if you turn the TV on and there is nothing on there that you like?

Mr. Boss. Turn on the radio.

Senator Moss. That's a good alternative. Do you have homework to do?

Mr. Boss. Sometimes.

Senator Moss. Do you sometimes put that aside because you want to watch television?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. I was afraid of that. So they must have some TV programs that you like. What about the advertising you see on television? Do you see commercials you like to watch?

Mr. Boss. No.

Senator Moss. Do you just kind of ignore them?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. Do they ever puzzle you with what they are trying to sell you or why they are trying to sell you something that way?

Mr. Boss. Sometimes.

Senator Moss. Do you ever go to your parents and tell them you want to buy something because you saw it on the commercial?

Mr. Boss. No.

Senator Moss. Have you ever noticed or do you notice that the kids you play with might be getting into scraps after watching television, trying to imitate them in any way?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. Does this go on very much?

Mr. Boss. No.

Senator Moss. Do you get involved in any of them?

Mr. Boss. Sometimes.

Senator Moss. Do you watch the cartoons? Do you look at those cartoon shows?

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. How do you like them?

Mr. Boss. They are OK.

Senator Moss. What about your friends? What do they talk about when they are talking about television?

Mr. Boss. When we go to school they just talk about the shows that were on last night.

Senator Moss. When they talk about them, do they try to illustrate what went on?

Mr. Boss. No.

Senator Moss. Do you think TV is good or do you think maybe we ought not to have so much of it?

Mr. Boss. Well, I like it.

Senator Moss. You like it?

You're young enough so you never remember when there wasn't television. You started when you were very young watching television.

Mr. Boss. Yes.

Senator Moss. Well, thank you, Steven. I am glad you have been here this morning. You have heard a lot of people talking about television and you can see we are rather concerned about it.

We want to find out what the children themselves think about it. And you have come down to help us and we thank you for it.

Mr. Boss. Thank you.

Senator Moss. We now come to the broadcasters who have been sitting here listening to the testimony all morning. They are the ones who affect program content the most.

We do appreciate having all of these people come here and we will ask them to come up as a panel, if they will.

Mr. Lloyd?

STATEMENTS OF JAY LLOYD, VICE PRESIDENT AND STATION MANAGER, KSL INC., MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, UTAH BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH; LAMAR SMITH, PROGRAM DIRECTOR, KUTV, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH; DAN RAINGER, PROGRAM MANAGER, KTVX, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH; BRUCE CHRISTENSEN, GENERAL MANAGER, KBYU-TV, BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY, PROVO, UTAH; AND MILT DAVIS, ACTING MANAGER, KUED, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. LLOYD. We have a video tape that I believe will answer some of the questions we have had today. We'd like to go through that now. Dan Rainger, the program manager of KTVX, Channel 4, will now proceed with that video tape.

Mr. RAINGER. Everyone in the television industry has been distressed with the excess of sex and violence in network programs and especially the impact of violence on children. We at KTVX, Channel 4, have been extremely concerned about the growth of violence and permissiveness, too.

At Channel 4 for the past many years, we have a News Advisory Board which fairly well represents a good cross section of our viewing audience and who each month discuss with the Channel 4 management to discuss local problems in all phases of life in our community.

We read and answer the hundreds of letters that we receive, and through most of these letters and phone calls runs the continuing problem of sex and violence and their impact on children.

We explain that we carefully review programs and feature films and commercials, and in many cases have moved objectionable themes away from the children-dominated areas. We edit local feature movies for excessive violence and are extremely sensitive to the placement of local programs over which we have sole control. We take our responsibility seriously.

But the big hue and cry and phone calls and letters fell on the network shows. The permissiveness in some of the situation comedies, the violence of the police shows, and, of course, the playing of feature films that were "R"-rated in the theaters.

We on the local level couldn't answer all the questions that were thrown at us, so we decided that this year—at our annual luncheon meeting of our News Advisory Board, which is attended by all past and present board members—we would invite three of the top people in the world to discuss sex and violence and its impact on children and to answer all questions.

The three people were Dr. Victor Cline, professor of psychology University of Utah, Alfred R. Schneider, a vice-president of ABC Television, and Dr. Melvin S. Heller of Temple University.

We videotaped this luncheon and within a few weeks we will present a 60-minute special of the highlights of this session for the general viewing public. The tentative date for this special is Saturday, March 6, 4:30 to 5:30 p.m.

For today's meeting, we would like to show you portions of this videotaped luncheon with the opening remarks on the subject of sex and violence on the network level and what's being done about it.

The man charged with "doing something about it" for the ABC Television network is Alfred Schneider, vice-president of Standards and Practices, whose sole responsibility is the broadcast standard of every program on the network.

Mr. Schneider?

Mr. SCHNEIDER. [Video tape.] Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for inviting us to join today for this exchange of views.

One of the best ways I have of getting to know what our audience is thinking and feeling is to meet with them at functions as this and to engage in this give-and-take, and I welcome it.

I think that Pat Willey should be congratulated for arranging for this meeting. As members of the station's advisory board, you ought to be commended for your interest in what appears on television. As a parent, myself, I have the same interest in what my children watch, and I am concerned about the effect television has upon them.

I would like to begin these remarks with a description of what the ABC broadcast does. Standards and Practices is, in effect, a euphemism for the word "censorship." How it reviews program material for matters of taste, for the portrayal of violence, and its relationship for adult and sexual themes.

The structure at the American Broadcast Co.'s Standards and Practices is in a position different from any other division. Under the umbrella of ABC Television, all the departments dealing with television, the television network, the owned stations, the sales department, and research, promotions, sports, and a number of others report to the president of the television division.

ABC News and Broadcast Standards and Practices are not under this umbrella. We report directly to the president of the corporation.

The reason for this separation is simple. Considerations of sales and ratings are important to other divisions, but they should not influence the operation of news, and they should not intrude on the decisions of standards and practices. In this manner we operate as a system of checks and balances.

Now, what can we do? Basically the function of standards and practices is to see to it that all commercial and entertainment material, exclusive of news and sports that appears on the ABC Television network, conforms to standards of good taste, honesty, and decency, and that implies the policy directing the elimination of gratuitous violence, violence for the sake of violence, and the sensational programs dealing with adult subject matter.

These are standards established by the National Association of Broadcaster Television Code through the review board, of which I am a member.

Again that sounds quite simple. In practice, let me assure you, it's a difficult and often anxious matter. What may constitute good taste to you could be totally alien to, say, a steelworker in Pittsburgh, a farmer in Georgia, or a college student at Berkeley.

Our audience consists of some 70 million television households, comprising more than 200 million people. They represent every age group, lifestyle, educational level, moral ethic, social, religious classification imaginable.

To get a consensus is most difficult. To arrive at a uniform definition of "good taste" is probably impossible. Add to this unscientific equation the traditions of free speech and free thought on which this country is founded, and you can appreciate the job deciding what is suitable is extremely hazardous.

Let me give you an example. Recognizing concern in the handling of violence on television, the three television networks instituted at the start of this season the family viewing concept.

We endeavored to set aside a period of the evening in prime viewing hours in which all members of the family, parent and child, can watch and enjoy a program together comfortably without embarrassment to each other.

The hours set aside were 7 to 9 p.m., eastern standard time, and 6 to 8 p.m., central time. As to this last point, let me anticipate the question. For here in the mountain time zone 8 p.m., eastern time, is 7 p.m.

We have begun to examine the feasibility of broadcasting with a standard based on clock time. That is, local time throughout the

country. At the present time, this would require prohibitively expensive transmissions to each time zone.

This would mean a change in certain audio viewing patterns and perhaps even the lifestyles. Research has indicated to us that on the east and west coast viewing by children aged 2 to 11 peaks between 8:30 and 9 p.m., while viewing in the central and mountain time zones peak between 7:30 and 8 p.m., 1 hour earlier. We are continuing to attempt to wrestle with this difficult problem, and it has not as yet been solved.

After the first 4 months of this experiment indications are to us that it is working. Complaints have decreased from station managers and are down about 50 percent from viewers and from Washington, where our severest critics are found.

The indications are that the concept is well-received. Senator John Pastore, probably the most outspoken critic of violence, has said: "The industry has responded with self-regulation. I strongly support these broadcasters and network reforms."

Now, the other side of the coin. The Hollywood production community spearheaded by some producers and three trade unions has instituted a lawsuit against the NAB, the FCC, and the networks, charging censorship of their efforts through the family viewing policy. So you see, what is specific responsible self-regulation for one person is censorship to another.

Our problem then is to perceive what the current standards of taste and decency are around the country, and then apply these standards to our programming efforts.

We have made a special effort to understand the effects of televised violence on children. Five years ago we allocated \$1 million for a series of studies in this area. The thrust of our effort has been to impart to the Hollywood production community a sense of what the public will and will not accept, particularly as it pertains to violent episodes, sexual references, and expletives on television.

Before production begins for each season, I visit with the producers of each television program, with our editors at the various production companies that supply the programs for our schedule. We go over the ground rules program by program of what we consider to be acceptable and unacceptable material.

We have few hard and fast rules, but we have some. For example, frontal nudity is not permitted, and we do not allow unique portrayals that could be considered instructional in the use of weapons or the avoidance of detection.

We do not, however, exclude any issue from being treated on television. We think we have a challenge to present mature, serious themes. If these themes are treated with taste, with care, we believe there is no reason why they cannot be brought to the television screen.

That group then goes to work and draws up outlines for serious episodes. We scrutinize every outline with an eye toward the dramatic conflict involved. Good storytelling is the reaction of people in conflict. Creative artists and their audiences must take into account all the emotions and actions that come into play at times of stress; and violence is one of them.

We do, however, emphasize that we expect the depiction of the results of violence, the consequences, to be portrayed and sometimes that is not pretty.

Also, we do expect that when the development calls for the use of force, the amount, the necessity for such use should be presented in such a way so as to meet a standard of reasonableness. If we have found that a writer has used violence to solve the conflict for shock value, we ask that he revise his thinking and come up with a more meaningful solution.

We apply the same restrictions on the use of language. We don't permit strong language to be used merely to shock. But when it is necessary for the development of a character, we cannot emasculate it. Similar procedures are followed through final editing.

Despite what some people believe, we do not permit "X"-rated movies to be shown on our network. However, we do acquire "R"-rated films. Many of the best movies made today are those with an "R" or a "PG."

First, our editors review the film to be certain it is suitable for transmission into the home, and they prepare a report on the suitability. The edited version is screened to insure conformity with standards and practices' requirements.

If the film is rated "R," the edited version is then resubmitted to the MPAA. If they feel the edited version we have made would have qualified for a "PG" or "G," then the film is judged eligible for airing.

If it is not, then it is reedited until it does qualify for a "PG" or a "G" rating.

In this brief talk, I have covered the responsibilities in the operation of my department as they apply to programing. Mel will tell you a little bit about his violence studies.

Before I close, one word about responsibility. We recognize that the responsibility between the broadcaster and the parent is joint. There is no substitute for parental discriminatory supervision. Nor is there a substitute for our responsibility to the children, but we also have a responsibility to the total audience to maintain television as a vigorous, vital, and changing medium.

I hope I can answer your questions.

Mr. RAINGER. Next, I would like you to hear a few remarks of Dr. Melvin S. Heller, clinical professor of psychiatry and director of the Division of Forensic Psychiatry at Temple University Medical School.

Dr. Heller also acts in a consulting capacity in broadcast standards and practices for ABC Television. Dr. Heller has been conducting studies on the effect of television violence on children for the past 5 years, and here is a short portion of some of his opening remarks regarding some of the experiments he has done. Dr. Melvin S. Heller.

Dr. HELLER. It seems to me that from the tremendous contributions of researchers like Burkowitz, Dr. Cline, we have had an enormous beginning which shows that there is a certain amount of aggressive behavior in the form of play behavior, in the form of controlled laboratory behavior.

But we don't know much about the long-term effects. So, these kids were studied from day to day. What were they like in the schoolyard, in the dormitories? We did not get teachers' disciplinary reports.

Youngsters predisposed to aggression have about the same level of aggressive violence before and after. This doesn't surprise us. But we will talk about the implications.

What about cartoons? We have the same results with the cartoons. We studied several hundred known youthful violent offenders. We determined that they are in the violent population, 16 to 18.

As juveniles, 30 percent of these had struck somebody with a blunt instrument; 28 percent of them had stabbed somebody; 23 percent had shot somebody. It is noteworthy that 23 percent of them had received a serious blow with a blunt instrument, and 44 percent had been stabbed themselves, and 15 percent had been shot.

So we went and we looked at the relative influence of television, and what we found that was enormously important was that 22 percent of these offenders admitted it. Also, 22 percent of these people confessed to and elaborated on the criminal techniques that they tried which they first saw demonstrated on television. One of them said, "Hey, I got this burglary alarm, and I had seen it the week before. Very simple."

Television is an enormously capable teacher. But in no instance did we find a criminal career that was caused by media-depicted violence. That's kind of a cop-out.

Everybody would love to find some simple answer to the problem of violence. Here we have gun control. I am all in favor of gun control.

We want to control pictures of guns on television, but not the guns themselves. That doesn't sound to a psychiatrist very rational. I know that hunters and all who have a legitimate need for guns—maybe they can have them.

We found that imitation is an enormously important thing. We found a simulation in play activities and preoccupation. But no meaningful short-term or long-term change in real, actual aggressive—let me change that, assaultive behavior.

It's one thing to push and shove, and it's another thing to hit the kid with serious intent. That is violence. There is an awful lot of rough and tumble in the family. This is what goes on. If you want to call that violence, you can call it violence.

However, I want to conclude by stating that while entertainment is the primary product of network television, it requires no research to recognize that television informs and teaches and influences children through a variety of ways which encourage both conscious and unconscious modeling and imitation.

Television's potential as a teacher and influencer of human behavior is larger than its entertainment function. Everybody recognizes television as a powerful teacher. In a society increasingly beleaguered by violence, its portrayal on television is a matter of ongoing social concern and consequence.

The alternatives for television are these: To eliminate violence completely or haphazardly and make believe that it never occurs, or to learn to handle violence responsibly so that its potential for good is augmented.

It is the dehumanized portrayal of victims which we're trying to avoid here. Millions of dollars of laboratory and survey research alone will not supply the answer to what children learn from television and how, nor will anecdotal accounts from individual parents, critics or myself or anyone else.

What and how children are learning from television deserves study only by attention to the response of young children to television programs as part of their regular classroom discussions.

If children are learning bad things from television, or anything at all, the logical place to find out more about it is where their learning is assessed daily, the classroom. Certainly Bugs Bunny is worth as much discussion as Hansel and Gretel. It is clear that television teaches something. What better prospect do we have?

The best teachers are also good entertainers, and both professions need to come closer together in the complementary development of audiovisual techniques.

The completion of 5 years of studies has involved a major commitment and continuing interest of the American Broadcasting Co., which is going to award each year additional research grants to selected academic persons who are going to work more on their own projects.

I would say that throughout the 5 years, editors' workshops we have conducted, and consultations on regular scripts have given us increasing knowledge about the massive challenges in laying down guidelines which are not eternal roads forever, but ways in which editors and script writers can approach more responsibly the media depiction of violence.

Thank you.

Mr. RAINGER. I hope what you have just seen showed what the television industry is doing today to police itself and the care taken each day to every single program aired.

On a local level we at channel 4, and of course all the other Salt Lake television stations, take our responsibility to our viewing public seriously. We take great pride in the programs we present, not only in prime time, but entertaining and wholesome programs in the children's areas and the family viewing area.

It's a common misconception that we passively condone permissiveness and more sex and violence on the air. We don't.

And through the efforts of people like Al Schneider, Dr. Heller, Dr. Cline, and responsible people like you, the television industry will be able to set realistic guidelines consistent with the tastes of the majority of the American viewing public.

Thank you.

Senator Moss. Thank you.

Jay?

Mr. LLOYD. Thank you, Senator Moss.

We have referred to Dr. Cline, and I have to say in the studies I have read, there are almost as many varied opinions on violence and the effects of violence in television as there are individuals, as you could tell from the people today, and also from those psychiatrists, and so forth.

I would like to submit a few items for your perusal written by Dr. Joseph Klapper. I want to present that as evidence.

Senator Moss. Thank you. We will accept that in our files.

Mr. LLOYD. You alluded earlier regarding the morning programming for children and the value of it.

I might point out, and I will just a little later, that a good share of the morning programming now is logged on our logs not as entertainment, although that is bad for children. But it is logged as instructional.

First, I would like also to submit for your perusal and your convenience a study of pleasures received by children who observed "Fat Albert and the Cosby Kids." The primary effort of the study was to determine to what degree the social effects were communicated to its audience of children.

The next is a study of messages received by children who viewed the episode of "U.S. of Archie." The objective was to determine to what extent the television program communicated historical and technical facts and pro-social messages to the audience of children. I submit that.

And the third is a study of messages of children who observed an episode of the "Popcorn Machine." I would like to submit that.

Next I would like to discuss for a moment our program schedule at channel 5. My colleagues here will talk about their own programs. This is merely a list of CBS and KSL programs that deal directly with children. Many times people say: "What do you do for children?"

I would like to just read some of them. They are instructional and again, saying that they are entertaining doesn't mean they are bad.

While you are looking at that program schedule, I would like to point out that I feel not only KSL but all the local stations are far ahead of the country in what we do for the children. And I would like to just point a few of those out. The Children's Christmas Parade, which we do every year, is listed there. Romper Room that we have been carrying for 19 years and Young Americans Educational Competition. Talent Showcase, where we bring talent from the young people throughout the State and surrounding States. These are just a few of the things that we do. And I submit this as some evidence what we do at KSL for the children.

I feel all the programs in most cases, our news, our sports, and I think really the young people told our story today. I know my children know more about what is going on in the world from watching the news on television, they know more about sports than I ever knew and I think we have to give television credit for those things.

I would like to talk about our responsibility locally. We have heard about the network. I am sure all of the people and maybe you gentlemen do not know that even though the networks go to these great efforts, that we still are responsible as licensees for our own community. We have preempted programs. We have delayed programs. And we have edited programs. As late as January 30, we preempted a program called "Bob and Ted and Carol and Alice." We did not feel it should come into our market.

The following week, "The Getaway," I thought the network did a really good job of editing. But we felt for our community—we still made four further edits and we informed the network of it.

One other subject I would like to touch upon, most people condemn television stations or they condemn the networks for the type of programs they have. They say: "Why do you force that type of program on us? We don't want to watch that."

And that is not true about the networks and the stations literally spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in research basically through research firms to find out what the tastes of the people in New York City and Salt Lake City are.

Now, they were not as sophisticated in years past as they are, and I would like to just, if I may read a paragraph from the latest TV Guide, talking about those ratings and how they take a pulse on the public as to whether or not we like a program. For example, "Beacon Hill" appeared on CBS television network this fall. The program executives thought it would be a good show, and they thought it would appeal to a mass audience. That is our responsibility, to reach a mass audience. After 2 or 3 weeks, they found out that the people

did not like "Beacon Hill." After 13 weeks, "Beacon Hill" was taken off the air.

On the other hand, "Gunsmoke" was left on the air for 18 years. It wasn't left on the air because someone at the network liked cowboy shows. It is because you and I and Mrs. Jones next door were figured in those surveys; we said, "I like it" or "I don't like it."

I would like to quote now Mr. Robert Wood, president of CBS. Mr. Wood says that, "The quicker you get the information, the quicker you are able to make a decision."

So, maybe by October we will have more information on hand than we had in the old days by the middle of December. So, if you have data, a lot of statistics, to do nothing about them would not be responsible.

I might point out as a result of that, the 27 shows that started this fall on the various networks, 16 of the 27 have failed. Failure means only one thing: That the American public did not accept them. They did not want them in their living room and so they didn't watch them. I think that the thing we overlook in committees, in groups such as we have had today, that they are the people who decide what we have on television.

In closing, just a couple of statements. I don't think television—I think we have to take the responsibility in our own home. We feel that we are doing a fine job consulting. We realize the responsibility that we have to not only the children but to adults, and it is something we are working on every day.

I would like to now call on Mr. Lamar Smith, the program director of KUTV.

Senator Moss. Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH. At KUTV we are concerned with these questions. A child may have a need largely which grows out of his peer group, and school and family relationship; often he comes to television to satisfy that need. What he finds there has to be of importance to the broadcaster.

The average child from a stable environment should find much to add to his experience; and while it is questionable that any one medium can completely fill all the needs of everyone, KUTV makes it a policy to telecast programs which cover a broad range of material from instructional and cultural to a variety of entertainment. We have programed an average of 42 shows a week specifically designed for viewing by children. And as the list which has been made available to those here shows, over the last 5-month period, 57 special programs have been presented, about 7 specials per month. These programs reflect an intent not to fulfill a desire to increase audiences or get a good survey return, for these programs rarely pull large audiences, but to supply needs. So, the selective viewer can often find needs fulfilled.

Mere numbers, of course, do not present a picture of content and quality. Here the responsibility of the station lies in properly choosing materials, placing programs in proper time slots, and eradicating unsuitable portions if necessary. This responsibility is not shunted aside but is reflected in station policies, many of which are not generally recognized by the public. As an ongoing policy, KUTV reserves the hours from 3 to 8 p.m. during the week, all day Saturday and Sunday, as well as early evening on weekends as those hours when

children are watching, and programs accordingly. Standard policies cover not only those areas, but areas adjacent to those times, since children are often present in later hours.

On KUTV during the evening hours, motion pictures are shown on the average of four per week or approximately 208 features per year. Of that number, about 8 or 10 are presented which contain materials of questionable interest to children. This represents about 5 percent of the total number of features. After previewing in advanced screening sessions, a determination is made either to delay the program edit, cancel, or run it in its time slot with suitable advisory warnings being presented at the opening, one-half hour within, and on the promotional materials.

Feminine hygiene product advertising presented by the network runs by their policy after 10 p.m. New York time. Those spots appear for our time zone between 9 and 10 p.m. KUTV as a regular practice does not run these spots, but covers them with public service announcements. These commercials are not shown between 3:30 and 10:30 p.m. weekdays or before 10:30 p.m. on weekends.

Our policy on running commercial movie trailers on R- or X-rated movies follows a similar pattern, with first a close scrutiny of the materials in the commercials and then a placement which is well out of the hours when children are viewing. PG-rated movies are handled in much the same manner.

KUTV has over the years rejected many programs and commercial announcements which we have felt unsuitable. Features have been moved to late weekend hours, cuttings have been made from network and local presentations, and in some instances programs have been completely canceled.

While this selective policy is enforced constantly at our station, we like to recall the incident of a program "Born Innocent" in which we cut out a scene of sexual violence—the same scene which caused a wave of emotional protest throughout the rest of the country. When the network presented it, it had excised the same material. The objection in our area was minimal.

Again, the question of what children are doing with television is of primary importance to KUTV; and recognizing the needs and uses being made, we have established a policy of awareness to it.

We have heard a great deal about sex and violence and particularly violent behavior and how it affects the individual.

Mr. Lloyd has pointed out that there are probably as many research units which have come up with the opposite answer. We would like to submit this particular article, one of the latest reports on research on the relationship between exposure to TV violence and aggressive behavior. The researchers have done analysis on data discussed in one of the studies for the Surgeon General.

They find that exposure to violent TV does not predict aggression. The authors discuss previous evidence and why their findings are in contrast to some of the previous studies. This article is called "Television Violence and Violent Behavior" and it is from the magazine Social Forces, volume 54 (2), December 1975.

Senator Moss. Thank you. We will be glad to have that for our files.

Mr. LLOYD. Now we would like to hear from Mr. Milt Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. I appreciate the opportunity of being here.

I would like to compliment the commercial television stations in Salt Lake. Often we are at odds with one another but I think they are doing an excellent job for children. I would like to say that first to indicate that we feel they are trying to do a job that needs to be done.

I would like you to know that PBS has a method for dealing with programs that are of questionable concern or that they feel might be objectionable. When they come in, they are flagged. That requires a viewing by the program people. Normally that also requires that we go to an advisory council and let them view that material. If they as a council, and they represent, of course, a wide area of people within this community, if they say the film should be acceptable we air the film or the show. If they say "No," then we don't air the film.

We feel that is one of the areas where we have tried to meet our requirements to find out what the public really does want. Public ascertainment has not been mentioned here but that is one of the areas that the commercial stations are dealing with and public stations are attempting to deal with. We have an excellent communications department on the campus and we have applied for a grant to do a study on ascertainment.

We are already dealing with ascertainment to find out what the public wants to see and why they would like to see it.

I get concerned, and I guess I have to indicate to you that by education I am a sociologist and I get concerned when people say that they should deal with reality. Very often reality is quite harsh. Violence in our society is quite harsh. Reality may not be then what we want to show on TV.

Oftentimes I think we have the responsibility as broadcasters to eliminate some of that. I think primarily we as parents have the tremendous responsibility to be aware of what our children see. I am very delighted when my 6-year-old will watch something like "Boston Pops," which he does.

I don't think that the public television sector which is to provide an alternate source of viewing can do that very effectively if we have passive, irresponsible parents.

I think that we have to be cognizant of what is there. We have to use the guides. We have to use the newspapers. We have to be aware of the tremendous resources available to us from television. And I think that that gets right back to the issue, the ultimate that we are talking about, the influence of our industry in the home. And that influence is only there because we are willing to have it there. Regardless of how many sets are in your home your responsibility as a parent and my responsibility as a parent is to see that my children are seeing the things and listening to things and, as you suggested, Senator, reading the things that are of value.

Senator Moss. Thank you.

Now we will hear from Bruce.

Mr. Christensen?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Senator.

I appreciate the opportunity of being here. I would like to make just a couple of observations and perhaps additions to things that have already been said.

It is KBYU-TV's philosophy to provide an alternative source of programing to the general public. The particular emphasis we have

on instruction and programing for children is outlined in the material we have presented in our program guide. We broadcast approximately 10 hours a day of programing that is designed specifically for children of preschool age. And we feel that this programing is an important alternative in our community.

The thing we find distressing is that so little of this programing is being watched by the general public. It's available and the signal we have is good. KBYU's programing is available for use in homes as well as the material said to be objectionable. Ratings show, however, that sex and violence free programs are not being watched.

I would suggest to the people who are concerned about exposure to violence and sex that they should take the time to review the program guides in much the way Mr. Davis suggested.

I think the committee would do well to recommend to the educators that some program of media literacy is important in our elementary schools.

We teach people how to read and how to deal with books that may be objectionable there but we spend little time in a media literacy program that encompasses the visual as well as the written kind of material people are exposed to.

I think that's important and something the committee should look into is the possibility of developing that kind of a program in the schools across the country.

I would also think it is important that continued support for public broadcasting come from the Congress. Public broadcasting is spending roughly \$40 million a year on its national program service. Commercial stations are spending well over a billion dollars in their national programing.

If we are able to compete with programs like "Sesame Street" and "Electric Company" the financing for those programs is important. And I think it would be up to the committee to see that funding continues to be made available, making public broadcasting an alternative. People then should be taught to exercise their agency in selecting programs that will be important to be viewed by the public.

Thank you. And, again, I appreciate the opportunity to come here today.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Bruce. I appreciate the response from all of you and specially the taped presentation on the monitor. Although we couldn't put the picture in the record, we will have the words.

We come back to this thing about children imitating the violence they see.

The Surgeon General's report was unanimous in the conclusion that televised violence and antisocial behavior were casually related. And the broadcast industry scientists join in that, including Dr. Klapper, who was referred to here.

Don't you think that even if there is a 50-50 chance that excessive violence is harmful that that would indicate we need to move more sharply away from it?

Mr. LLOYD. I believe we are. CBS had 39 percent less violence in 1975 than 1974. I think we have come a long way.

We are moving into that direction, I believe. We talk about all the police shows. We are on the air for a long time every day. We have five police shows. We have the "Cannons" and "Switches" and

"Blue Knights" and those really I wouldn't call—they are not the "Magnum Force" that was alluded to earlier.

The "Magnum Force" was not on television. That was a movie in the theater. That was not on television. I think the industry is moving in that direction because when Cannon punches somebody in the nose, I don't think that has the adverse effect. When you think of all the "Phyllises" and the "Mary Tyler Moores" and the "Carol Burnetts" and all the things we do, our police shows are very minimal, frankly.

We talk a lot about violence and frankly I get letters every day and I am sure the other managers do, they are usually a form letter signed by 200 people that say: Please get rid of the violence on television. And I usually respond to the first name because that's the only address and say: If you're concerned about a "Cannon" or "Kojak" or whatever, this is my private line, please call me and discuss it with me. But they very seldom call. It's one of those things where they say television is full of violence so they sign the form letter but they don't stop to think whether they really saw something which will harm me or do I get on the bandwagon because Mrs. Jones brought the form letter around?

I think there is something there and we are working on it. But I sometimes wonder if there is as much there as some people seem to think there is.

Senator Moss. Would it be feasible to construct a sort of violence profile so we could measure the degree of violence in programing?

Mr. LLOYD. I will ask anyone else to answer that.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. I think CBS measures what kinds of violence takes place and the instances of that per program are counted. And I think that material probably could be made available to the committee. I know it has been reported in Broadcasting Magazines and other areas. I think those profiles are available.

Senator Moss. Is that being done by CBS alone or is that across the broadcast industry?

Mr. TEMPLE. That was done across the industry and all networks demonstrated a reduction in episodes of violence this past season compared to the year before. And some networks had a greater reduction than others, partly because they had had more violence the preceding year. But all have reduced. And this, I am sure, is available to the public and can be available to you.

Senator Moss. We talked about the children's programs that are available. But how many hours a week do these children's shows represent? You detailed a number of them on your listing here. And the others have alluded to them. With the testimony about the number of hours children sit and watch television, I wonder really how effective are just a few special shows.

Mr. LLOYD. These are just the percentage of shows that are strictly children's shows, almost cartoons. That doesn't mean that that's all there is for television. The kids, my children love Carol Burnett. They love a lot of the entertainment shows. Frankly, you look at the audience profile of "All in the Family" which has been one of the top shows in the country for several years now, that there are a lot of children who are entertained and I'm sure learn a great lesson.

Some people say: Gee, that is really bad. But if you look at it, there is usually a good moral lesson. If you discuss that and say: "Look what happened," I think it's a great learning experience for the children.

So when you say, "What percentage for children?" I would say hopefully most of it is for children although it is a great medium of entertainment for all ages.

We can't deprive the elderly or the middle-aged or whatever from this great entertainment vehicle and say it all has to be just strictly Charlie Brown; although the children love Charlie Brown they also love some of the other things which are very good for them, I think.

So I think the percentages—you can't look at percentages and say: "What do you do just for children?" And I think we do a lot for children.

Senator Moss. Children, of course, watch what is there. And therefore we can't segregate programing entirely for children although some programs are made to appeal specifically to children. But have to make sure that our adult programs are not destructive to children.

Are there standards that ought to be imposed on the adult shows widely viewed by children?

Mr. RAINGER. For instance, something that hasn't even come up really is daytime television which really in the sexual way of looking at it is rougher yet, and there are some children home.

Mr. SMITH. I don't think that we can rule out the fact that we have adults in the world and there are those programs which are concerned with them. So as the gentleman on the video tape stated, that they are not going to just program for a particular area. They consider the total gamut of ages and types. So I don't think that we can say adult programs per se are going to be ruled out entirely. I think the whole trick to it is in using discretion as to where they are programed and also having advice along those lines.

Mr. RAINGER. I sure would like to see the results. Are they watching this or are they watching the more general type of situation comedies or et cetera? This is what makes it so tough. There are lots of committees and groups who come to us and say: "This is what children should be watching."

But saying what they should be watching and then finding out whether they are watching it or not are two different things.

Senator Moss. Of course, all of us have children, our own or grandchildren or closely related and we have to measure what we would want them to be observing against standards we think broadcasters ought to apply. And this is the difficulty. None of us want censorship.

How are we going to get appropriate programing and advertising for our children to view?

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. It's a difficult area. We talked about public ascertainment. It's like trying to program your station by a committee of 5,000 or 10,000 people. It's very difficult to program that way.

I don't think that what may be acceptable to Dan Rainger may be acceptable to Milt Davis. We sit here at the same table and yet not agreeing, and perhaps not with you, on what we would want our children to view. I think that somehow to say you're going to set a standard uniquely for a total industry with so many variant regional concepts of what would be pornography, for example, would be extremely difficult.

Mr. LLOYD. Senator, I made a comment a minute ago on children's programing and what they should watch. We have one of the finest programs in the country on "Captain Kangaroo," a CBS television network program. But the children that watch it, you could probably crowd in this room. It's great. The parents think it's great. The

pressure groups say it's great. For some time we had only a half-hour of it. But the pressure required that we put on the full hour. With our rating system we know what people like and what they don't like. That's broken down to how many women 18 to 34 like it. How many over 50 like it or dislike it. It's a very sophisticated system for measuring the people. We get a pressure group of 45 people who come down who say, "We don't like it and you should take it off."

But we have to look at the broad scope and serve our whole community and we do have that one measurement of our community, what they like and what they don't like. And if it's bad or if it has too much violence the people don't watch it and it goes off the air.

Senator Moss. Well, thank you, gentlemen, I would like to continue the dialog. I have already kept you through the noon hour and we must terminate the hearing.

I think we have heard some excellent observations here this morning from the community and from the broadcasters themselves who are responsible for the programing and what is on the air. We have all agreed that television is a scarce public resource. You broadcasters are trustees of this resource. We know that TV affects children. So what we are trying to do is to find what standards we should expect the industry to apply.

I commend the broadcasters for demanding and effecting higher standards of programing. They claim they have cut down somewhat on the violence. I think there is consensus that gratuitous violence has no place in programing, whether it is aimed at children or adults. We have an earlier example of when the Congress felt that advertising on television could be so damaging to the public health of this country that it was banned. As you all know, cigarette advertising went off the air.

Cigarettes are a product known to be damaging to health and the TV ads selling that product were quite offensive. That indicates how strong the national feeling is about television as a medium.

And that's the reason, I suppose, why you have taken these steps for which you should be commended. What we are trying to do in the committee is to understand this marvelous medium and to measure its performance against our social needs in all of our communities. We need to determine what guidance we ought to give to those who are the trustees of the right to use the medium and to enter all of our homes every day.

Well, you have contributed greatly to our record and I appreciate it very much. Let me say that I appreciate the many things you have told us that you're doing in this area.

Mr. LLOYD. Senator, may I add one thing?

Senator Moss. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. We have talked about programing and what we have tried to do, but we have left one thing out and that is the public service we do. We have public service announcements that we run, appealing to children not to get involved in drugs, not to drink and drive and do some of these things.

So I think we have a good force there. People don't think about those. The average layman thinks that's a commercial or something. But that is a public service message aimed at the children.

Senator Moss. That is a good point and I am glad you put it in the record. We tend to talk about the parts we worry about in tele-

vision and gloss over perhaps the good things that are being done in many areas.

You mentioned one of them, public service. But TV opens up the whole universe to children. Imagine the broadcasts we have seen from the moon.

Thank you very much. I have kept you all. We are now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:15 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

[The following information was subsequently received for the record:]

Researchers haven't begun to ferret out the impact of television in the United States. Yet the generation of children who saw it into existence is now through graduate school. Although some dramatic changes in social traditions and personal morals have been traced in America, we're still reluctant to say television was a cause of the changes, for better or worse. It would be naive to suggest there is a sole cause for any widespread, social change in any culture. The following changes in the U.S. come to my mind:

1. Educators report a downturn in the norms of national standard achievement tests. The college entrance exam norms recently dropped another ten points.

2. The illiteracy rate has skyrocketed. (Many people still read the newspaper, but it would be interesting to find out how many adults prefer to get the news via television.)

3. Family ties have weakened.

4. There is a turn from Judeo and Christian religious practice.

What does television offer except current news and indepth news specials? According to some statistics, violence such as murders, kidnappings, torture scenes, and lynchings comprise much of the fare. They comprise the plots of police, detective, and other adventure fiction viewed nightly by millions. Violence has raised from 17 percent in 1954 to 60 percent of the total fare today (R. M. Liebert, E. S. Davidson, J. M. Neale). And it's getting a lot of attention. At sixteen the average American child has spent as much time watching television as he has spent in school (A. Siegel). Is it a teacher substitute? And mother can get a lot of work done while the children watch TV. Is it a parent substitute?

When we took our television out to the garage ten months ago, it wasn't a big sacrifice. The moving soap operas and the squealing, money giveaway programs during the day had been wasteful. The children caught the evening adventure hour just before they went to bed. The thrills and chills of murder which are supposed to turn on the masses only upset the children to tears. My husband and I had to make a decision: Is the television worth it? Is it giving us anything in return for our attention? We decided it was not. I am glad to report the following changes in the family since the television has been gone:

1. Communication levels are up. We talk more to each other, and the content is more meaningful. We aren't distracted by peeling our ears off to a television show. What the children say to us and we to them is more important. It is sad to think that some families spend the only time they have together watching television, the dinner hour.

2. The children read for entertainment. Library books, jigsaw puzzles, and other thinking toys occupy their time. While they are young and their imaginations are most stimulated, they create games of make-believe that used to entertain children before the Saturday morning cartoons became the fashion.

3. The children exercise their bodies more. No more red eyes from the glare of the screen. Even in the winter they get outside.

4. My husband and I are more confident that as few adverse influences as possible become models for the children's imitation. The television is an excellent place for children and teenagers to learn crime and mischief. The crimes perpetrated as a result of television show imitation have been open admissions of people who have plagued airports with bomb threats or murdered in specific, plot oriented ways.

Statistically these changes in our family have no significance. And there aren't enough people in the U.S. who would give up their televisions to test the positive influence for themselves. It seems humorous to me, however, that the people I tell this story to candidly admit we have an excellent idea; or they defend themselves immediately by saying they and their children watch television very little. In all there is a pervasive air of embarrassment about televisions.

But the TV is here to stay. It was and is a revolutionary device. It is used to bring closed circuit programs to schools. It is an outlet for hard working men and women who come home at the day's end to unwind. It entertains people who are bedridden or confined to the house. But for the rest of the time, it is wasteful to live life vicariously when we should be living the experience firsthand.

In trade for America's loyalty, the industries have given little in return to promote health and welfare. They say they just want to please the public, and the sponsors will say they just want to sell their soap. What they are doing is selling the audience out between the shuffling of the profits and exploiting of young people with the crime our own government abhors as a national problem.

Recommendations:

1. That the government step up research on the bad effects of television violence on children and unstable, crime-prone adults.

2. That the government start a campaign for educating parents to television monitoring for their children.

3. That the industries compromise their prime time hours for the health of the audience that watches most. Children are apt to watch television right after school until nine o'clock at night on weekdays.

The former recommendations don't call for federal intervention in programing. That would be a hazard itself in time. The answer rests with public education and an open claim of concern by congress to a problem they have been aware of for a long time and ignored.

CHARLOTTE OGARA.

REFERENCES

1. Davidson, E. S., Neale, J. M., Liebert, R. M. Aggression in childhood: the impact of television, In V. B. Cline (ed.), "Where do you draw the line," Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1974.
2. Siegel, A. The effects of media violence on social learning, In V. B. Cline (ed.), "Where do you draw the line." Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1974.

STATEMENT OF VICTOR B. CLINE, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

THE EFFECTS ON CHILDREN AND CURRENT STATUS OF SEX, VIOLENCE AND ANTI-SOCIAL CONTENT OF COMMERCIAL TELEVISION PROGRAMMING

U.S. television programming has in recent years been subject to critical scrutiny and on a number of occasions taken to task by not only congressional investigatory committees but also large numbers of behavioral scientists, as well as (more recently) the Surgeon General of the United States. The specific focus of most of these critical appraisals has been the tremendous volume of explicit violence and sexuality screened in prime time programming.

However, with but few exceptions, there has been little explicit sex on the TV screen. Last Fall's "Born Innocent" on NBC-TV depicted the broom rape of a teen-age girl in highly visual and provocative fashion. But this is a rarity. While there is a great deal of sexual promiscuity on day time TV soap operas, the camera has usually stayed out of the bedroom. Nighttime "movies of the week" originally R rated are usually toned down somewhat by judicious editing and sexual explicitness varies weekly, but it never approaches what is seen on the commercial theatre screen. Blue jokes and frank discussions are occasionally seen on the talk shows, plus some double entendres and leering suggestiveness on some of the audience participation game shows. About the only place that soft core pornography is currently programmed is on closed circuit networks for room guests in some large hotel and motel situations.

In fairness to the television industry we might briefly mention the other side of the coin, some of their very real contributions to our life and culture. There has been an extremely high quality of programming across a broad spectrum of sports. This has been done with superb professional skill and finesse, all free (of course) to the viewer. Most news and weather programming must also be given high commendations plus the many public interest documentaries. And while a few critics have perceived some bias in news presentations, I would suggest that TV news broadcasting may, in fact, be one of the least biased media sources of news—because they are under such close scrutiny by the public and government regulatory agencies. I think the television industry has to be given very high marks and much praise for their election coverage as well as major news happen-

ings of any sort, including the Watergate hearings. National Geographic specials, public issues forums, religious specials, documentaries on a great variety of public interest subjects have been done with high skill on numerous occasions. With regards to sheer entertainment, it is possible to see free movies nightly, many of recent origin, of very high quality. And if one is fair about it one must also note, that the TV industry in their furious scramble for ratings, do (in fact) attempt to really give the public what they want to see. Thus, the free market operates with great vigor as the major networks try to please the viewing public with their various presentations, and with most shows it is indeed the viewer who in the end decides the fate of this series or that, by the simple expedient of turning his set on or off to particular shows.

However, because 98% of American homes do have at least one TV set, and many homes have sets in every bedroom and family room, which amounts to almost total penetration of American family life and culture, I think the television industry has to be especially sensitive and responsible for the type and quality of their programming. They have a power and instrumentation to influence the values and behavior, especially of young people, unknown to any other age or time historically. And the oft-stated notion that parents can easily monitor objectionable TV shows by simply turning off the switch or changing channels simply does not hold water or work out that way in real life. Many mothers work, and parents are frequently away from home in the evenings leaving it up to the children themselves to pick and choose the programs of interest. Or young girls often babysit in another's residence where no adults are present. And for parents to know in advance the type and quality of material on all specific shows is nearly an impossibility.

It is also important to note that the average child spends more time in front of a television set during a year's time than in front of a teacher in the classroom at school. In fact, that average child will spend more of his waking time looking at TV than any other type of activity (except sleep) in his growing-up years. Studies of pre-schoolers at home, show that they are exposed to more television before they start first grade, than the average student will spend in the classroom during four years of college. In sum, what this all means is that television is the most powerful acculturating agent in our society, next to the family. And where the family is immobilized due to divorce, marital discord, alcoholism, mental illness or similar serious social problems, television may be the most potent instructional force in the child's whole life.

A great deal of research from scores of studies has convincingly demonstrated again and again the power of modeling and imitative learning to teach children new behaviors and values. What children see others doing on TV or in films can have profound effects on them. The essential formula is "monkey see, monkey do." We teach table manners this way, how to tune a car, how to share, how to negotiate differences, plus most other aspects of social living.

Although violence has always been part of American entertainment in television, its frequency has increased steadily over the past twenty years. In 1954, for example, violence saturated action and adventure programming accounted for only 17% of prime time network offerings; by 1961 the figure was 60%. By 1969 about eight in ten prime time shows contained violence, and the frequency of violent episodes was almost eight per hour. During the 70's this high rate of violence programming has continued unchanged. Studies by the National Association for Better Broadcasting has estimated on the basis of their investigations that the average child during the decade of their life between 5 and 15, will watch the violent destruction of more than 13,400 persons on television.

When one considers that crimes of violence are increasing currently in excess of nine times the rate of population growth in the U.S. we have cause for major concerns about the possible contribution of television to this tragic statistic. When one considers that the U.S. has the highest homicide rate among the great countries of the world, five to seven times greater than the United Kingdom, and 10 times greater than the Scandinavian countries (where violence on TV is a small fraction of that in the U.S.), the research on imitative learning and modeling looks increasingly important in suggesting possible causes.

My research at the University of Utah suggests that two things happen when children are exposed to excessive quantities of violence in their media entertainments. First: they become desensitized to it in time, they become emotionally blunted, their conscience becomes dulled, they lose the capacity to feel sympathy and empathy for the victim of violence. Second: they are taught again and again, thousands of times, in specific detail how to commit violent acts. Both of these together increase, in time, the probability that they, when frustrated, may them-

selves commit a violent act against another human being. And even though they have been taught good ethical behaviors by their parents, there will be the battle within themselves to control their aggressive impulses, and sooner or later they may lose that battle or may themselves become the victim of some other child's violent behavior whose controls break down. All that has been said about violence also applies to pornography, a great deal of which nowadays in much adult cinema involves sexual aggression, against women as well as general sexual exploitation of females.

What should we do about this situation? With regards to television I am opposed to direct censorship. But I would suggest community protests be focused against offending programs by writing the FCC (Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.) with carbons or xerox copies to the (1) local station and (2) the sponsor of the product (his address will be on his product label). If a station is unreasonably irresponsible in its programming then I'd suggest citizens in the community challenge its being relicensed when that comes up for renewal (every three years).

With regards to the industry itself I would suggest that they deliberately program material that has more pro-social content embedded in it. My reviews of the literature on the subject suggest that what audiences want, especially in the young adult and adolescent years, is lots of action. I think it is possible to have exciting content with lots of adventure, daring, and movement, etc., without having to resort to explicit violence explicitly shown. The thing that "hurts" especially young viewers is the specific close up shock depictions of man killing man. What I am suggesting is that it is possible to have even some violence, which is certainly a part of life, depicted in non-harmful ways. You reduce the overall quantity, you don't exploit it, you show it in a responsible context, and you give it some moral quality, you don't glamorize it, and through certain filmic techniques soften its explicitness.

We are now seeing an increasing amount of research suggesting that you can teach (through modeling and imitative learning via films and TV) all kinds of prosocial behavior such as (1) showing sympathy for others in distress; (2) sharing; (3) providing aid or assistance to another; (4) controlling one's aggressive impulses; (5) making up for bad behavior by apologizing, making amends, etc.; and (6) resisting temptation.

Knowing the power of their medium, why can't the creators of television put prosocial behaviors and themes into their television entertainments? Why can't they make a contribution to our society rather than exploit it? I think this is not only possible, but also financially remunerative as the Waltons, for example, has demonstrated. And, of course, programs with prosocial material can be extremely diverse in content and theme, and need not all be depictions of syrupy family togetherness. The Blacks, Chicanos, Indians, women and other minority groups have, for a decade, successfully been involved in "consciousness raising," calling attention to their unique problems and exploitation. The time has come, I would say, for concerned adults and especially those with growing children, a particularly vulnerable group, to engage in "consciousness raising" with regard to the abuse and exploitation of our media entertainments. If we don't protect our young, who else will?

OREM, UTAH, February 4, 1976.

To Whom It May Concern:

Maybe this letter could be sent to the Senator who is interested in banning Evel Knievel's performances on T.V. I hope he wins.

My 6-year-old grandson watched the news and saw these performances. One day he put a large rock got on his bike and was going to jump over the rock. He landed on his head and was rushed to emergency for X-Rays. He received a concussion. The black and blue swelling took quite some time to disappear. Thank God! all is well now, we hope. My grandson's name is John Andrew Behrman.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN HARRISON.



KUTV/NBC SELECTED PROGRAMMING APPROPRIATE FOR YOUNGER VIEWERS
Beginning Fall, 1973

DAY & TIME	PROGRAM
September 3 9:00-9:00 pm	THE UNWILLING WARRIOR - Sandburg's Lincoln
October 18 5:00-6:00 pm	RED GOLD - 60 FATHOMS BENEATH THE SEA
October 21 4:00-5:00 pm	SOUL AND SYMPHONY - (Special Treat) <i>Concert for children comprised of rock, classical, jazz</i>
October 23 11:30am-1:00 pm	FIRST LADIES' DIARIES: Martha Washington
October 27 7:00-8:00 pm	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SPECIAL - The Amazon
October 28 7:00-8:30 pm	LIFE (Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness)
November 1 10:30-11:00 am	LIFE - Children's version
November 1- December 6 12:30-2:30 pm	MOVIE FLASHBACKS - (Classic Stories) Count of Monte Cristo Man In The Iron Mask Corsican Bros. Captain Caution Son of Monte Cristo
November 1 2:30-3:00 pm	AMERICAN LIFESTYLE - Sam Houston
November 3 7:00-8:00 pm	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SPECIAL - Journey to the High Arctic
November 8 2:30-3:00 pm	AMERICAN LIFESTYLE - William Jennings Bryan
November 11 4:00-5:00 pm	FLIGHT FROM FUJI - (Special Treat)
November 22 2:30-3:00 pm	AMERICAN LIFESTYLE - Woodrow Wilson
November 23 6:00-8:00 pm	WILLIE WONKA AND THE CHOCOLATE FACTORY
November 24 7:00-8:00 pm	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SPECIAL - Grizzly
November 27 8:00-10:00 am	THANKSGIVING DAY PARADE
November 27 10:30am-1:00 pm	A MAN FOR ALL SEASONS
November 28 2:30-3:30 pm	BILL DAILYS' HOCUS POCUS GANG

November 28 7:00-7:30 pm	WINNIE THE POOH AND TIGGER TOO
December 1 7:00-8:00 pm	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SPECIAL - Reptiles and Amphibians
December 3 7:00-8:30 pm	VALLEY FORGE - (Hallmark Hall of Fame)
December 8 7:00-8:00 pm	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SPECIAL - Siberia, The Endless Horizon
December 9 4:00-5:00 pm	THE DAY AFTER TOMORROW - (Special Treat) <i>Science fiction adventure explaining Einstein's theory of relativity</i>
December 12 7:30-9:00 pm	THE RIVALRY (Hallmark Hall of Fame) <i>Documentary of Lincoln-Douglas Debates</i>
December 15 7:00-8:00 pm	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SPECIAL - The Great Mojave Desert
December 26 7:00-8:00 pm	THE WORLD OF MAGIC <i>Magic Show with Bill Cosby, Doug Henning, Orson Wells</i>
January 3 5:00-6:00 pm	DESTINATION SPECIAL - Baja, California
January 4 4:00-4:30 pm	DANCE IN UTAH <i>Dance in Utah Schools and communities</i>
January 10 5:00-6:00 pm	DESTINATION SPECIAL - African Animals on Camera
January 11	DESTINATION SPECIAL - Sea of Cortez
January 12 7:00-8:00 pm	CROSSING FOX RIVER - Sandburg's Lincoln
January 13 4:00-5:00 pm	JUST FOR FUN - (Special Treat) <i>Merry tour of six of the nation's leading amusement parks</i>
January 18 1:00-3:00 pm	ADVENTURE MATINEE - World Safari
January 20 2:00-3:30 pm	FIRST LADIES' DIARIES: Edith Bolling Wilson
January 25 2:30-4:00 pm	ADVENTURE MATINEE - Time for Every Season
February 1 1:30-3:00 pm	ADVENTURE MATINEE - The Unknown Wilderness
February 10 4:00-5:00 pm	PAPA AND ME - (Special Treat) <i>Living relationship between an elderly man and his grandson</i>
February 15 3:00-5:00 pm	ADVENTURE MATINEE - North Country
February 17 7:00-8:00 pm	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SPECIAL - (Coral Jungle) Sharks: Terror and Truth
February 22 3:00-5:00 pm	ADVENTURE MATINEE - Pieces of Eight
February 24 7:00-8:00 pm	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SPECIAL - Wild River
February 29 3:00-5:00 pm	ADVENTURE MATINEE - Alaska Safari

March 1 7:00-8:00 pm	NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SPECIAL - Mystery of Animal Behavior
March 7 6:00-7:00 pm	BOUND FOR FREEDOM <i>Two teenage boys are brought from England to America as indentured servants in Colonial times.</i>
March 9 4:00-5:00 pm	STUNTMAN - (Special Treat) <i>Behind the scenes look at how stuntmen plan and perform daring feats.</i>
March 14 3:00-5:00 pm	ADVENTURE MATINEE - Hunters of the Witch
March 21 2:00-3:00 pm	MEXICAN...AND AMERICAN <i>Contributions made by Spanish-speaking generations to the Amer. Republic</i>
March 30 8:30-10:00 pm	LIBERTY (Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness)
April 3 10:00-10:30 am	LIFE - Children's Version

WEEKLY PROGRAMMING

Wednesdays 7:00-8:00 pm	LITTLE HOUSE ON THE PRAIRIE
Mon-Friday 3:00-3:30 pm	BEWITCHED
Mon-Friday 3:30-4:00 pm	FLINTSTONES
Mon-Friday 4:00-4:30 pm	THE PARTRIDGE FAMILY
Mon-Friday 4:30-5:00 pm	HOGAN'S HEROES
Mon-Friday 5:00-5:30 pm	ADAM-12
Saturdays 6:00-6:30 am	EMERGENCY + 4
6:30-7:00 am	JOSE & THE PUSSYCAT
7:00-7:30 am	SECRET LIFE OF WALTER KITTY
7:30-8:00 am	PINK PANTHER
8:00-8:30 am	LAND OF THE LOST
8:30-9:00 am	RUN JOE, RUN
9:00-9:30 am	BEYOND THE PLANET OF THE APES
9:30-10:00 am	WESTWINDS
10:00-10:30 am	THE JETSONS
10:30-11:00 am	GO USA
11:00-11:30 am	TWO'S COMPANY - <i>Local children's production - all facets of life in U.S.</i>
6:00-6:30 pm	WILD KINGDOM
7:00-8:00 pm	EMERGENCY
Sundays 5:30-6:00 pm	CANDID CAMERA/YOU ASKED FOR IT
6:00-7:00 pm	THE WONDERFUL WORLD OF DISNEY - (2 and 3 hour specials on 10/26, 11/1, 11/2, 11/9, 11/16, 11/30, 12/7, 2/14, 2/15)

CHRISTMAS SPECIALS

December 14 6:00-6:30 pm	THE LITTLE DRUMMER BOY
December 14 6:30-7:00 pm	THE TINY TREE
December 19 7:00-7:30 pm	THE FIRST CHRISTMAS <i>The Story of the First Christmas Snow</i>
December 22 7:00-9:00 pm	SCROOGE

KBYU-FM/TV

Entertainment Worth Remembering



<u>Name of Program</u>	<u>Air Time</u>	<u>Age Group</u>
Sesame Street	Monday - Friday, 8:00 - 9:00 a.m.	Preschool - 1
"	Monday - Friday, 12:00 - 1:00 p.m.	"
"	Monday - Friday, 4:00 - 5:00 p.m.	"
"	Saturday, 4:00 - 5:00 p.m.	"
Mister Rogers	Monday - Friday, 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.	Preschool - 2
"	Monday - Friday, 11:30 - 12:00 a.m.	"
"	Monday - Friday, 5:00 - 5:30 p.m.	"
"	Saturday, 5:00 - 5:30 p.m.	"
Kultur Kaleidoscope	Monday, 10:00 - 10:20 a.m.	3 - 5
"	Tuesday, 2:30 - 2:50 p.m.	"
Performance	Monday, 10:20 - 10:30 a.m.	9 - 12
"	Tuesday, 10:15 - 10:25 a.m.	"
"	Tuesday, 2:50 - 3:00 p.m.	"
All About You	Monday, 10:30 - 10:45 a.m.	1 - 2
"	Wednesday, 1:30 - 1:45 p.m.	"
"	Thursday, 2:30 - 2:45 p.m.	"
Cover to Cover II	Monday, 10:45 - 11:00 a.m.	5 - 6
Cover to Cover I	Tuesday, 11:15 - 11:30 a.m.	4 - 5
Cover to Cover II	Thursday, 11:15 - 11:30 a.m.	5 - 6
Cover to Cover I	Thursday, 1:45 - 2:00 p.m.	4 - 5
Cover to Cover II	Friday, 10:00 - 10:15 a.m.	5 - 6
Storytime I	Monday, 11:00 - 11:15 a.m.	Kindergarten - 3
"	Tuesday, 1:30 - 1:45 p.m.	"
"	Friday, 10:45 - 11:00 a.m.	"
Community Workers	Monday, 11:15 - 11:30 a.m.	2 - 3
"	Tuesday, 11:00 - 11:15 a.m.	"
"	Thursday, 2:15 - 2:30 p.m.	"
Villa Alegre	Monday - Friday, 1:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Preschool - 2
Inside/Out	Monday, 1:30 - 1:45 p.m.	4 - 6
"	Tuesday, 1:45 - 2:00 p.m.	"
"	Friday, 10:30 - 10:45 a.m.	"
Bread & Butterflies	Monday, 1:45 - 2:00 p.m.	4 - 7

KBYU Promotion Dept., C-306 HFAC, BYU, Provo, Utah 84602 Provo 374-1688, SLIC 531-7780 ext 3551

Channel 11 Children's Programming
Page 2

<u>Name of Program</u>	<u>Air Time</u>	<u>Age Group</u>
Bread & Butterflies	Wednesday, 11:15 - 11:30 a.m.	4 - 7
"	Thursday, 2:45 - 3:00 p.m.	"
Utah Natural Science	Monday, 2:20 - 2:40 p.m.	5 - 12
"	Thursday, 10:50 - 11:10 p.m.	"
American Vignettes	Monday, 2:40 - 2:45 p.m.	ungraded
Utah and You	Tuesday, 10:00 - 10:15 a.m.	4
"	Wednesday, 11:00 - 11:15 a.m.	"
Probe	Tuesday, 10:30 - 11:00 a.m.	ungraded
If You Live In A City, Where?	Tuesday, 2:00 - 2:30 p.m.	4 - 6
Matter of Fact	Wednesday, 10:00 - 10:20 a.m.	7 - 12
"	Thursday, 10:30 - 10:50 a.m.	"
Images and Things	Wednesday, 10:40 - 11:00 a.m.	5 - 8
"	Friday, 2:00 - 2:20 p.m.	"
Self Inc.	Friday, 10:15 - 10:30 a.m.	7 - 8
Utah Glimpses	Thursday, 11:10 - 11:15 a.m.	4 - 7
Utah Focus	Friday, 1:30 - 2:00 p.m.	7 - 12
Carrascalendas	Saturday, 5:30 - 6:00 p.m.	ungraded
National Geographic	Specials	

Channel program news

A LIST OF REGULAR PROGRAMS AND SPECIALS APPROPRIATE FOR YOUNGER VIEWING
SEEN OCTOBER 1975-APRIL 1976 ON KSL-TV

The White Seal	CBS	Oct. 17	
A Home of Our Own	CBS	Oct. 19	True story of Rev. Wasson who founded home for orphaned children.
Babe	CBS	Oct. 23	Life of great woman athlete Babe Didrikson Zaharias.
You're A Good Sport, Charlie Brown	CBS	Oct. 28	
Magnificent Monsters of the Deep	CBS	Nov. 14	
The Mysterious Island	CBS	Nov. 15	Famous classic tales.
What's A City All About?	CBS	Nov. 22	
A Charlie Brown Thanksgiving	CBS	Nov. 22	
Children's Christmas Parade	KSL-TV	Nov. 22	Annual Christmas parade signaling the start of the Christmas season.
Julie Andrews on Sesame Street	KSL-TV	Nov. 27	
The Adventures of Robin Hood	KSL-TV	Nov. 27	
Gianni Schicchi (CBS Festival of the Lively Arts for Young People)	CBS	Nov. 28	Puccini's one-act opera.
<u>CHRISTMAS SPECIALS</u>			
Rudolph, the Red-Nosed Reindeer	CBS	Dec. 7	
'Twas the Night Before Christmas	CBS	Dec. 9	

Channel program news

A LIST OF REGULAR PROGRAMS AND SPECIALS APPROPRIATE FOR YOUNGER VIEWING
SEEN OCTOBER 1975-APRIL 1976 ON KSL-TV

Dr. Seuss' How the Grinch Stole Christmas	CBS	Dec. 12	
Frosty the Snowman	CBS	Dec. 12	
A Christmas Carol	CBS	Dec. 13	
A Charlie Brown Christmas	CBS	Dec. 15	
Youth Songfest	KSL-TV	Dec. 21	5,000 high school students sing in Tabernacle
Danny Kaye's Look-In at the Metropolitan Opera	CBS	Dec. 6	CBS Festival of the Lively Arts for Young People.
The Homecoming	CBS	Dec. 12	Story of a poor Blue Ridge Mountain family during the Depression.
One to One	KSL-TV	Dec. 18	Julie Andrews and the Korean Children's Relief
The Bible	CBS	Dec. 19	
Christmas Child	KSL-TV	Dec. 24	A small boy is lost on Temple Square on Christmas Eve
Magnificent Year of the Wildebeast	CBS	Dec. 26	
Boy Ten Feet Tall	KSL-TV	Jan. 3	Orphan boy travels through jungle in Africa seeking his aunt in Durban.
Sinbad the Sailor	KSL-TV	Jan. 2	
Charles M. Schultz and Charlie Brown	CBS	Jan. 9	25th Anniversary celebration.

Channel 5 program news

A LIST OF REGULAR PROGRAMS AND SPECIALS APPROPRIATE FOR YOUNGER VIEWING
SEEN OCTOBER 1975-APRIL 1976 ON KSL-TV

-3-

Tom Sawyer	CBS	Jan. 11	Film musical of Twain novel.
Family Circus	CBS	Jan. 23 Jan. 30 Feb. 6	Top European circuses
Enchanted Cottage	KSL-TV	Jan. 16	
Addie and the King of Hearts	CBS	Jan. 25	
The Adventures of Mark Twain	KSL-TV	Jan. 28	
Story of Louis Pastuer	KSL-TV	Feb. 6	
Music for Young Performers (CBS Festival of Lively Arts for Young People)	CBS	Feb. 8	New York Philharmonic plays works by Mozart, Vivaldi, Bach, Vaughan Williams assisted by young musicians.
Be My Valentine, Charlie Brown	CBS	Feb. 15	
Mowgli's Brothers	CBS	Feb. 15	From Kipling's "The Jungle Book."
What are the Loch Ness and Other Monsters All About?	CBS	Feb. 14	
Balloon Safari	CBS	March 8	Balloon trip over Africa.
Ailey Celebrates Ellington (CBS Festival of Lively Arts for Young People)	CBS	March 13	Alvin Ailey dance company performs modern dance works to music of late Duke Ellington
Charlie Brown's Arbor Day	CBS	March 16	
Pinocchio	CBS	March 27	Musical version with Danny Kaye, Sandy Duncan.

Channel 5 program news

A LIST OF REGULAR PROGRAMS AND SPECIALS APPROPRIATE FOR YOUNGER VIEWING
SEEN OCTOBER 1975-APRIL 1976 ON KSL-TV

-4-

The Wizard of Oz	CBS	March 14	Classic film with Judy Garland, Ray Bolger, Bert Lehr, Jack Haley, Frank Morgan.
Sterling Scholars	KSL-TV	April 13	Annual awards for top Utah high school seniors.
Captain Kangaroo	CBS	Daily	19 years on CBS
Romper Room	KSL-TV	Daily	19 years on KSL-TV
Wild World of Animals	CBS	Sat.	Adventures of wild animals
Young Americans	KSL-TV	Sat.	Educational competition
Call It Macaroni	KSL-TV	Monthly	Adventure of rediscovery of America
Marshall Efron's Sunday	CBS	Sun.	Non-denomination Sunday School for all ages.
Talent Showcase	KSL-TV	Weekly	A showcase of local talent
Scoby-Doo	CBS	Weekly	Lovable Great Dane who solves mysteries
Shazam	CBS	Weekly	Encourages universal justice and understanding
Valley of Dinosaurs	CBS	Weekly	Pre-historic people, relationship of man and earth.
Fat Albert	CBS	Weekly	Shows struggle of value conflict and peer group problems.
In The News	CBS	Weekly	Mini program to whet young appetites for current events.

Channel program news

A LIST OF REGULAR PROGRAMS AND SPECIALS APPROPRIATE FOR YOUNGER VIEWING
SEEN OCTOBER 1975-APRIL 1976 ON KSL-TV

-5-

The Waltons	CBS	Weekly	The importance of a family
CBS Children's Film Festival	CBS	Sat.	Cultural plays for children.